

A  
DEFENCE

O F

Arch-Bishop *USHER*

AGAINST

D<sup>r</sup> *Cary* and D<sup>r</sup> *Isaac Vossius*,

Together with

An INTRODUCTION concerning  
the Uncertainty

O F

CHRONOLOGY;

And an

A P P E N D I X

TOUCHING

The signification of the words *שׁוֹמְרֵי הַמִּצְוֹת* and *Νεο-  
μηνια*, as also Of the men of the

Great SYNAGOGUE.

---

By JOHN MILNER, S. T. B.

---

C A M B R I D G E,

Printed by *J. Hayes* for *Benj. Tooke*, and are  
to be Sold by *W. Graves* Bookseller in  
*Cambridge*. 1694.





Octob. 29. 1692.

## Imprimatur,

*Gabr. Quadring*, Procan.

*Humf. Gower*, Prof. Marg.

*Joh. Covel*, Coll. Christ. Præfct.

*Ja. Johnson*, Coll. Sid. Mag.



Printed by J. Smith for Benj. Jackson and are  
to be sold by W. Chiswick Bookseller in  
Chancery Lane 1704.



---

# THE CONTENTS

**C**hap. I. *The Introduction concerning the uncertainty of Chronology.*

Chap. II. *Whether Lunar months were in use with the Israelites before the Babylonish Captivity.*

Chap. III. *Of the month Dioscorinthius 2 Macc. II. 21.*

Chap. IV. *Of the time when Artaxerxes Longimanus begun his reign, and of the flight of Themistocles.*

Chap. V. *Of the time when Sanchuniathon, Semiramis and Nitocris liv'd.*

Chap. VI. *Whether Nabonasar was the same with Belshis.*

Chap. VII. *Whether Darius Hytaspis was the husband of Esther, also whether Artystona was Esther, and Atossa Vashti.*

Chap. VIII. *Whether Tiglathpileser was the same with Ninus junior the successor of Sardanapalus.*

Chap. IX. *Whether Moses was contemporary to Inachus.*

Chap. X. *Of that Alexander King of Egypt, who was reported to have made the Commonwealth of Rome his heir.*

Chap. XI. *Of Argon the first King of the Lydians after the Attyadæ, whether he was the Son of Ninus.*

Chap. XII. Of Egyptus, how many years inter-  
ven'd between him and Sefac 1 Kings 11. also  
whether he was the same with Sethosis; and of Jo-  
nathan, 1 Maccab. 9.

Chap. XIII. Of the duration of the Assyrian Mo-  
narchy, and of Herodotus, also of the Median  
succession.

Chap. XIV. Of the duration of the said Assyrian Mo-  
narchy against Dr. J. Vossius.

Chap. XV. Of the Study of Astronomy, whether it  
be as ancient as Nimrod, and of the Celestial Ob-  
servations sent from Babylon to Greece by Ari-  
stotles procurement.

Chap. XVI. Of the Egyptian Empire, when it began  
and how long it continu'd. Also of Constantinus  
Manasses.

Chap. XVII. Of the Septuagint.

An Appendix 1. Concerning the words *wt* and  
*vunvia* or *voynvia*, whether they do any where in  
the Scripture signify the New Moon. 2. Of the  
men of the Great Synagogue, and of the Books  
of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

CHAP.

## C H A P. I.

*The Introduction.*

**T**Need not enlarge in the praises of that great ornament of his Age, See and Country, the incomparable Arch-Bishop *Usher*. They that would be satisfied of the worth of that excellent person may read his Life with the Appendix to it, and more especially his Works, which sufficiently praise him in the gate: As they that would know how great an esteem the most eminent men for Piety and Learning in his time (not only in great *Britain* and *Ireland*, but also in other parts) had of him, may consult the Letters writ by them to him, and since Printed with his to them. Yet since his death several have appear'd publickly against him, and some of them have treated him very unbecomingly, to say no more. Of these I shall single out the Author of the *Palaeologia Chronica* Dr *Cary*, and him whom he hath call'd to be his Second, viz. Dr *Vossius*. Both these are displeas'd with the Arch-Bishop for shortning the

B time

time from the Creation of the world : but more especially D<sup>r</sup> Cary. He is displeased with *Petavius* and *Eusebius* upon the same account, but the storm of his displeasure falls most severely upon the Arch-Bishop. " Yet this ( says " he ) was nothing to that which Bishop *Usher* " did since in vindication of the *Masora*, by " a way of new righting of times and new sha- " ping of persons, far otherwise then was ever " taken notice of by any man living before. Thus D<sup>r</sup> Cary Part 2. Bo. 2. §. 3. Ch. 17. Now ( to pass by those obscure expressions New righting of times and New shaping of persons ) I grant that the Arch-Bishop may have offer'd some things to his Readers consideration, which no man had ever taken notice of before ; but then he doth it with such candor and modesty, as ( if he do erre ) may obtain his pardon from all ingenuous persons, And withall he confirms them with such Authorities and Arguments, as that it is not very easie for those that are not of his opinion to refute him. A further plea may be offer'd for him, drawn from the uncertainty of the greatest part of Chronology, by reason whereof no man can state the account, especially of Ancient times so, as that one or other shall not be ready to quarrel with it.



Of the uncertainty of the greatest part  
of Chronology.

I Say of the greatest part of Chronology, for I most willingly grant that part of it is certain: as 1. Whatsoever relating to Chronology is plainly expressed in sacred Writ, or may be deduc'd from it by a clear and undeniable consequence, that must be concluded to be certain. 2. The Chronology of Heathen writers, so far as it agrees with and is consonant to the Scripture Chronology, is also to be look'd upon as certain. 3. *Josephus c. Antiquities l. 1.* says that all men confess that *Alexander the great* dy'd in the 114<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, and if any one shall affirm that this account of his death (or any thing else, that is as universally and unanimously attested, as according to *Josephus* it is) is certain, I shall not gainsay. But as to other things, tho some have expressed very much confidence, and seem to have firmly perswaded themselves that they had demonstrated the certainty of them: yet I think it will appear that they have rather demonstrated their uncertainty. However I doubt not but every unprejudic'd Reader will be satisfi'd of the uncertainty of them. To manifest which, I shall not run through all the 4 Monarchies (that would be too tedious) but confine my self to the first,

i. e. the *Assyrian*: and I the rather pitch upon it, because Dr *Cary* is so much displeased with *Eusebius* and *Petavius*, and especially the Arch-Bishop, for shortning the time of that Monarchy. The method which I shall observe will be to take a view 1. Of Kingdoms, viz the Kingdom of *Assyria* it self and the Kingdoms contemporary to it, 2. Of persons and occurrences, and to shew how uncertain an account is given of the time of all these. I begin with Kingdoms, as

1. The Kingdom of the *Assyrians*. *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 95. says that the *Assyrians* had held the dominion of the upper *Asia* 520 years, when the *Medes* began to break from them. *Justin* l. 1. c. 2, and 3. says that the *Assyrians* had held the Empire 1300 years, when the *Medes* rebell'd against them. *Velleius Paterculus* l. 1. writes that the Empire was translated to the *Medes* when the *Assyrians* had possessed it 1070 years. *Ctesias* ap. *Diodorus Siculus* l. 2. will have the duration of that Monarchy to have been 1360 years. *Diodorus Siculus* himself will have it to have been above 1400 years. *Castor* ap. *Synellum* p. 168. allows to it An. 1280. According to *Cephalion* ap. *Synellum* p. 167. all those that reign'd after *Seminamis* held the Empire An. 1000. *Thales* ap. *Theophilum ad Autol.* l. 3. and *Lactantius* l. 1. c. 23. affirms *Belus* to have been An. 322. before the Trojan war. S. August.

*de Civit. Dei* l. 18. c. 21. says that the Empire of the *Assyrians* was translated to the *Medes* after almost *An.* 135. taking the time that *Belus* reign'd into the account. *Orosius* l. 1. c. 3. writes that *Babylon* was rob'd of its wealth, King and Empire by the *Medes* almost 1164 years after that it was built by *Semiramis*. *Africanus* ap. *Syncell.* p. 92, and 165. makes the duration of this Empire (including the reign of *Belus*) to have been *An.* 1460. Finally *Eusebius* says that all the years of the *Assyrian* Empire from the first of *Ninus* were 1240. [Because I shall have frequent occasion to alledge *Eusebius*, I desire it may be observ'd, that when I do alledge him as here without directing to the particular place, the citation is to be found in his *Chronicon*; and that I follow the Latin Edition of him at *Basil* in Folio.]

We have seen what different accounts the best Writers give of the duration of the *Assyrian* Empire: they differ also about the number of their Kings, and of the years that several of them reign'd. As to the number of the Kings, *Diodorus Sicul.* l. 2. reckons 30, making *Sardanapalus* the 30<sup>th</sup> from *Ninus*; whereas *Velleius Paterc.* l. 1. makes *Sardanapalus* to have sprung from *Ninus* and *Semiramis* in the 33<sup>d</sup> descent, the Son still succeeding the Father. *Eusebius* reckons 36 Kings beginning with *Ninus*, whereas *Syncellus* p. 165 taking *Belus* into the account reckons 41.

As to the time that several of the *Assyrian* Kings reign'd *Eusebius's* account differs much from that of *Syncellus*, as this Scheme following will manifest.

	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>	<i>Juxta Syncellum.</i>
Manchaleus whom <i>Syncellus</i> calls Asehalios	An. 30	An. 28
Iphereus or Spherus	20	22
Sparetus or as <i>Syncellus</i> calls him Sparthetos	40	42
Alcades or Alcatades	40	38
Lamprides	32	30
Solarmus	19	22
Tareus or Tentus	40	44
Ophratens	20	21
Ophratanes by <i>Syncellus</i> call'd Ephecheres	50	52
Sarpanapalus	20	19

Tho' the Empire is said to have been translated to the *Medes* upon the overthrow and death of *Sardanapalus*, yet the *Assyrian* Monarchy is usually supposed to have continued till the beginning of the *Persian*: so that *Nebuchadnezzar* and others that were long after *Sardanapalus* are reckon'd among the *Assyrian* Monarchs, particularly *Evilmerodach* and *Neriglassar* or *Nericaßolassar* to the former of whom *viz. Evilmerodach* *Berosus ap. Joseph. c. Apion. l. 1.* allots 2 years, and to the latter 4; but *Josephus* himself *Ant. l. 10. c. 12.* gives to the former *An. 18.* and to the latter 40; and the Ecclesiastical Canon *ap. Syncell. p. 209.* assigns to the former *An. 5.* to the latter 3.

2. The Kingdom of the *Egyptians*. According to *Eusebius* eleven of the *Egyptian Dynasties* were contemporary to the *Assyrian* Mo-



(7)

Monarchy, of which the 16<sup>th</sup> is the first, and the 26<sup>th</sup> the last. *Africanus* ap. *Synsell.* p. 61. &c. and *Eusebius* differ much as to these Dynasties.

	<i>Juxta Africanum.</i>	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>
The 16 Dynasty	An. 518	An. 198
The 17 Dyn.	151	103
The 18 Dyn.	263	348
The 19 Dyn.	204 or 309	194
The 20 Dyn.	135	178
The 22 Dyn.	116	49
The 23 Dyn.	89	44
The 24 Dyn.	6	44
The 25 Dyn.	40	44
The 26 Dyn.	150 or mens. 6	168

Besides all this they differ as to the number of the Kings that were in some of the Dynasties.

	<i>Juxta Africanum.</i>	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>
In the 19 Dyn.	6 Kings	3 Kings
In the 22 Dyn.	9	3
In the 23 Dyn.	4	2

They also disagree about the number of the years that many of the Kings in these Dynasties reigned, but I must not take notice of them all: yet I cannot but observe how *Herodotus* and *Manetho* differ sometimes from one, sometimes from both of them. As in the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, when *Africanus* and *Eusebius* allow to *Necao* the 2<sup>d</sup> only 6 years, *Herodotus* l. 2. c. 159. (who calls him *Necos*) gives him complete 16 years. So when *Africanus* allots to *Vaphres* only 19 years, *Herodotus* l. 2. c. 161. (by whom he is call'd *Apries*) assigns to him 25. And lastly *Herodotus* l. 2.

B 4

c. 15.

l. 157. gives to *Psammitichus* 54 years, and l. 3. c. 10. to *Amasis* 44; when *Eusebius* allows to the former only 44, and to the later only 42 or 43. And as to *Manetho ap. Joseph. c. Apion. l. 1.*, the discord between him and them will appear in this following Scheme.

In the 18 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty	<i>Juxta Manethon.</i>	<i>Juxta African.</i>	<i>Juxta Euseb.</i>
Achencheres or Acherres	An. 12 & mens. 1	An. 32	An. 12
Rathosis (ap. Euseb. Achoris)	9	6	9
Achencheres (ap. Afric. Chebres)	12 & mens. 5	12	16
Achencheres or Acherres	12 & mens. 3	12	8
Armeses (ap. Euseb. Remesses)	66 & mens. 2		68
Amenophis	19 & mens. 6	19	40
In the 19 <sup>th</sup> Dynasty			
Sethos	59	51	55
Rampses or Ramphes	66	61	66

3. The Kingdom of the *Sicyonians*. Which continu'd *An. 862*, according to *Castor ap. Euseb.* (in the *Basil* Edition, but in *Scaligers* Edition it is 962, not 862,) according to *S<sup>t</sup> August. de civ. Dei l. 18. c. 19. An. 959*: *Suidas in voce Σικων* says that it continu'd *An. 900*; the succession of the *Sicyonian* Kings which we have in *Scaligers Excerpt. gr. p. 361.* attributes to it *An. 980*, *Syncellus p. 97. An. 967*. So as to the particular Kings, *Eusebius* and *Syncellus* are not agreed how long severel of them reign'd.

	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>	<i>Juxta Syncellum.</i>
Telchin vel Stelchin	An. 20	An. 29
Epopeus	35	32
Laomedon	40	43
Sicyon	45	42
Polybus	40	43
Inachus	42	45
Pheilus	8	10
Adrastus	4	7
Zusippus	32	30
		Add

Add to all this that *Homer Iliad. 2. ver. 572.* seems to make *Adrestus* the first King of *Sicyon*, Σικων ὁδ' ἀπ' Ἀδρεστος ἀρχὴ ἐμβασί-  
 ρου: whereas *Egialeus* is usually said to have reign'd first there. So *Zeuxippus* is usually made the last King, and yet *Pausanias* in *Corinth.* reckons *Hippolitus* and *Lacestades* after him, and so do *Scaligers Excerpta gr. p. 363.* The same *Pausanias* omits the mention of *Polypides*, who was the next but one before *Zeuxippus* according to the usual account. So little agreement or certainty there is as to the very number of their Kings.

4. The Kingdom of the *Argives*. I need not mention that *Africanus* and many besides him will have *Moses* to have been born in the time of *Inachus* the first King of the *Argives* (see *Syncellus p. 63.*) and yet *Eusebius* makes *Inachus* to have been above 200 years ancients than *Moses*. *Eusebius* also and *Syncellus* disagree about the time that several of *Inachus's* Successors reign'd.

*Juxta Eusebium. Juxta Syncellum.*

	<i>An. 54</i>	<i>An. 55</i>
<i>Crassus</i> or <i>Criasus</i>	35	25
<i>Phorbas</i>	46	36
<i>Troyphas</i> or <i>Triopas</i>	21	24
<i>Cratopus</i>	50	58
<i>Ianaus</i>	41	35
<i>Lyceus</i>	23	37

Moreover as to the succession in this Kingdom of *Argos*, *Pausanias* in *Corinth.* differs both from *Eusebius* and *Syncellus*. He reckons

kons *Jafus* (if not *Gelanor* also ) among the Kings of the *Argives*, whereas *Eusebius* and *Synceſſus* make no mention of them. He alſo omits *Apis* and *Pratus*, the one of which according to them, was the 3<sup>d</sup>, the other the 13<sup>th</sup> King of the *Argives*. And *Apollodorus* l. 2. agrees with *Panſanias* in making *Pratus* King of *Tirintbe*, not of *Argos*.

5. The Kingdom of *Athens*. From *Cecrops* the firſt King ( as *Eusebius* *Synceſſus* and others account him, tho' *Panſanias* in *Attica* ſays that *Actæus* reign'd firſt, and that *Cecrops* ſucceeded him : yea he tells how ſome made *Porphyrion* to have reign'd before *Actæus* ) to the taking *Troy* wete 373 years according to the *Marmor Arundel.*, about 384 according to *Synceſſus*, almoſt 400 according to *Eusebius de Preparat.* l. 10. c. 9. As to thoſe that ſucceeded *Cecrops*.

	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>	<i>Juxta Synceſſum.</i>
<i>Oxyntes</i> or <i>Zyntis</i> the 13 King	An. 12	An. 10
<i>Timætes</i> or <i>Thymites</i> the 15 King	8	9
Of the <i>Archontes</i> that continu'd for life.		
<i>Agallus</i> or <i>Acatius</i> the 2	Reign'd 36	33
<i>Terſippus</i> the 4	41	40
<i>Phorbas</i> the 5	31	30
<i>Mezades</i> or <i>Megacles</i> the 6	30	28
<i>Æſchylus</i> the 12	23	14

Alſo to *Agameſtor* the 11<sup>th</sup> of theſe *Archontes* for life *Eusebius* gives 20 years, when *Synceſſus* allows him but 17 : yet ſays at the ſame time, that others allow him 40. He alſo tells us that tho' he with *Eusebius* allotts to  
Ari-



*Arifphron* the 9<sup>th</sup> of those *Archontes* only  
 30 years, yet *Africanus* gives him 31. *Hip-*  
*pomenes* was one of the *Archontes* that were to  
 continue for 10 years, and *Eusebius*, *Syncellus*  
 and others give him complete 10 years: yet  
*Suidas* in *Ἱππομένης* says that for a certain  
 fact he lost the Government before the time.  
 The 4<sup>th</sup> year of that *Hippomenes* was accord-  
 ing to *Pausanias* in *Messen.* the first year of  
 the 14<sup>th</sup> Olympiad: but according to *Euse-*  
*bius* it was the first year of the 15<sup>th</sup> Olym-  
 piad. To the decennial succeeded annual *Ar-*  
*chontes*, and the beginning of these is refer'd  
 by *Eusebius* to the 2<sup>d</sup> year of the 24<sup>th</sup> O.  
 Olympiad; but *Pausanias* in *Messen.* says plain-  
 ly that there were annual *Archontes* in the 4<sup>th</sup>  
 year of the 23<sup>d</sup> Olympiad, naming *Tlesias* as  
*Archon* then. [I know some alter *Pausanias*'s  
 words so as to make him say quite the contrary;  
 but I dare not deal so with *Authors*, unless I  
 have some very good ground or valuable Co-  
 py to warrant such a change.] There is no-  
 thing more probable then that *Tlesias* in *Pau-*  
*sanias* is the same with him whom the *Mar-*  
*mor Arundel.* calls *Lyfias*, who was the 3<sup>d</sup> an-  
 nual *Archon*, for *Creon* was the first (as *Vel-*  
*leius Paterc. l. 1.* with many more doth testi-  
 fie) and there was but one *Archon* between  
*Creon* and *Lyfias* according to that *Marble*.  
 And by the way there being a *lacuna* in the  
*Marble* thus (Since . . . *Ar. 418. Lyfias* be-  
 ing

ing *Archon* at *Athens*) perhaps it may be supply'd after this manner ( Since the beginning of the 2<sup>d</sup> *Messenian* war *An.* 418. *Lyfias* being *Archon* at *Athens*) just as *Pausanias* saith that the *Messenian* war began when *Tlesias* was *Archon* there. It is true the *Anonymous* writer in *Excerpt. gr. Scaliger. p.* 318. doth place *Tlesias* 3 years before *Creon*, not two years after him: but I question whether his Authority be such as may warrant us to correct *Pausanias* so as to make him say the contrary to that which he doth say in our copies. However that Author doth say that the year of *Creon* the first annual *Archon* was the 3<sup>d</sup> of the 24<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, whereas *Syncellus* p. 212. refers it to the 19<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, and adds that some refer it to the 25<sup>th</sup> Olympiad. In *Clemens Alexand. Strom.* 1. it is said that the beginning of *Theseus's* reign was 47 years before the taking of *Troy*, which agrees neither with *Eusebius's* account, nor that which is given by *Syncellus*. According to both *Troy* was taken in the last year of *Menestheus* the successor of *Theseus*: now according to *Syncellus* *Theseus* reign'd *An.* 31. and *Menestheus* 33. according to *Eusebius* the former 30 years, the later 24. om. years more. . . . .

6. The Kingdom of *Mycena*. *Apollodorus* 1. 2. says that *Electrion* reign'd at *Mycena* with *Taphius*, but *Eusebius* and *Syncellus* make no men-

mention of either of these: and *Syncellus* brings in *Pelops* between *Eurystheus* and *Atreus*; whereas *Eusebius* does not mention *Pelops*'s being King of *Mycena*. We are left wholly in the dark as to the time that *Perseus* reign'd there. To *Sthenelus* *Perseus*'s successor *Eusebius* (in *Scaligers* Edition) gives 8 years, and to *Eurystheus* 43; but in my Edition *Eusebius* makes *Eurystheus* to have reign'd An. 45. To *Atreus* and *Thyestes* *Eusebius* allots An. 65, *Syncellus* only 33. and according to *Homer* l. 2. v. 106. *Thyestes* seems to have succeeded *Atreus*, for he says, that *Atreus* dying left the Scepter to *Thyestes*; Ἀτρέως δ' ἐνίκων ἔλυσσε πολυάρην θυέστη. To *Agamemnon* *Syncellus* p. 170. with *Eusebius* gives 18 years; but at the same time observes that others do allot him 35 years, and p. 125. he says that some make him to have reign'd 33 years some 30 or 28. Likewise p. 125. he says that *Ægisthus* reign'd 7 or 17 years, and yet p. 170. he allows him only 5. *Orestes* according to *Eusebius* reign'd 15 years, according to *Syncellus* 23; but according to *Vellius Paterc.* l. 1. 70 years.

7. The Kingdom of the *Thebans*. The *Marmor Arundel.* makes *Cadmus* to have come to *Thebes* when *Amphictyon* reign'd at *Athens*, 64 years after the beginning of the reign of *Cecrops*; but *Eusebius* says that he came when

*Pan-*

*Pandion* was King at *Athens*, above 120 years after that *Cecrops* reign'd first there; and he observes also that some do set *Cadmus's* reign still later, and that above 100 years, when *Cecrops* the 2<sup>d</sup> was King at *Athens*. *Clemens Alexand. Strom.* 1. refers the coming of *Cadmus* to the time when *Lynceus* reign'd at *Argos*, but it is not certain when he reign'd there, whether we are to refer the beginning of his reign to the 13<sup>th</sup> year of *Pandion's* reigning at *Athens*, with *Eusebius*, or to the 18<sup>th</sup> year of *Erectheus* the successor of *Pandion*, with *Syntellus*.

8. The Kingdom of the *Corinthians*. *Diodorus Sicul. ap. Syntellum* p. 179. differs much from *Eusebius* as to the number of years that several of the Kings of *Corinth* after the return of the *Meracidae* reign'd.

	Juxta Diodor. Sicul.	Juxta Euseb.
<i>Aletes</i>	An. 38	An. 37
<i>Erion</i>	38	37
<i>Aristomedes</i>	30	35

In the margin in *Syntellus* p. 179. to *Aristomedes* 35 years are assign'd, and likewise in 2 *Latercula* in p. 180. and yet p. 185. only 31 years are allotted to him.

After *Automenes* the *Prytanes* of annual Rulers continu'd An. 90. according to *Diodor. Siculus*, about An. 120 according to *Eusebius*. After them *Cypselus* obtain'd the Government;



ment, and after him his Son *Periander*. To *Cypselus* *Aristotle Polit.* l. 5. c. ult. gives An. 30. to *Periander* 44. but *Eusebius* and *Synellus* allow the Father only An. 28. and *Diog. Laertius* in *Periandro* allows the Son only 40.

9. The Kingdom of the *Medes*. How differently the succession of the Kings of *Media* and the time of their several reign is represented by *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 96. &c, *Ctesias* ap. *Diodor. Sicul.* l. 2. *Eusebius* and *Synellus*, will best appear by the following Scheme.

Juxta Ctesiam.		Juxta Eusebium.		Juxta Herodotum.		Juxta Synellum.	
<i>Arbaces</i>	An. 28	<i>Arbaces</i>	An. 28			<i>Arbaces</i>	An. 28
<i>Mandaucæ</i>	50	<i>Solarmus</i>	30			<i>Mandaucæ</i>	20
<i>Solarmus</i>	30	<i>Medius</i>	40			<i>Solarmus</i>	30
<i>Artas</i>	50	<i>Cardicæ</i>	13			<i>Artas</i>	30
<i>Artas</i>	22	<i>Deioces</i>	54	<i>Deioces</i>	An. 53	<i>Deioces</i>	24
<i>Artas</i>	49	<i>Phaortes</i>	24	<i>Phaortes</i>	22	<i>Aphraartes</i>	31
<i>Artas</i>	22	<i>Cyaxares</i>	32	<i>Cyaxares</i>	40	<i>Cyaxares</i>	32
<i>Artibarnas</i>	40	<i>Altyages</i>	38	<i>Altyages</i>	35	<i>Altyages</i>	38
<i>Altyages</i>							

I must not omit that though these Authors, how much soever they disagree in other things, do all concur in this, that *Astyages* was the last King of the *Medes*; yet *Xenophon de Inst. Cyri.* l. 1. says that *Astyages* had a son, who was also his Successor in the Kingdom, viz. *Cyaxares*.

10 The Kingdom of the *Lydians*. The account which *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 7. &c. gives of the *Lydian* succession differs much from that of

of *Eusebius* and *Syncellus*. *Herodotus* writes that the *Heraclida* Reign'd from *Argon* the first of them to *Candaules* the last 505 years; whereas *Eusebius* and *Syncellus* take notice of only 3 Kings, viz. *Ardysus*, *Alyattes* and *Miles* or *Meles* before *Candaules*, and the years that these 4 Kings reign'd being all joyn'd together are only 79. After *Candaules* those reign'd who are by *Herodotus* call'd *Mermada*, and *Eusebius* with *Syncellus* agree with him as to the names and number of those that held the Kingdom, yet they dissent from him altogether as to the number of the years that they held it.

	<i>Juxta Herodotum.</i>	<i>Juxta Eusebium.</i>
<i>Gyges</i>	An. 38	An. 36 To the 2 of
<i>Ardys</i>	Reign'd 49	Reign'd 38 these viz.
<i>Sadyattes</i>	12	15 <i>Ardys</i> only
<i>Alyattes</i>	57	49 An. 37 are
<i>Cræsus</i>	14	15 allotted by <i>Syncellus</i> .

II. The Kingdom of the *Tyrians*. Tho' *Syncellus* p. 182. pretends that he hath the account of the *Tyrian* Kings which he gives us from *Josephus*, and it is very probable that *Theophilus ad Autol.* 1. 3. had his from him also; yet there is not a perfect accord betwixt theirs and that which we have in *Josephus c. Apion* 1. 1.

	<i>Apud Josephum.</i>	<i>Apud Theophilum.</i>	<i>Ap. Syncellum.</i>
<i>Baleazarus</i>	An. 7	An. 17	An. 17
<i>Ithobalus</i>	Reign'd 32	12	32
<i>Badezorus</i>	6	7	8
<i>Matgenus</i> or <i>Mertenus</i>	9	29	25

12. The

12. The Kingdom of the *Macedonians*. *Herodotus* l. 8. c. 139. names *Perdiccas* as the first King, and when *Thucydides* l. 2. says of *Archelaus* that as to warlike preparations he order'd things better then all the 8 Kings that were before him, he seems to consent there-to; for if *Perdiccas* was the first King, then there were just 8 before *Archelaus*. Yet *Justin* l. 7. c. 2. says that *Perdicca* reign'd after *Caranus*, as *Solinus* c. 9. says that he succeeded him. *Swidas* concurs with *Justin* in making *Caranus* the first King, and *Livy* l. 45. says expressly that he reign'd the first. They that please may also consult *Ausonius* Epist. 19. When *Justin* and *Solinus* say that *Perdiccas* succeeded or reign'd after *Caranus*, if their meaning was that he succeeded *Caranus* immediately, they are contrary not only to *Eusebius* and *Syncellus*, but also to the marginal successions of the *Macedonian* Kings which we have in *Syncellus* p. 262; for all these do reckon two Kings, viz. *Canus* and *Tyrimmas* between *Caranus* and *Perdiccas*. And so *Theophilus ad Autol.* l. 2. giving us the Genealogy of the *Temenida* makes *Canus* the Son of *Caranus*, and *Tyrimmas* the Son of *Canus*, and *Perdiccas* the Son of *Tyrimmas*. *Eusebius* makes *Caranus* to have reign'd An. 28. and to have begun his reign 36 or 37 years before the first Olympiad: but the two Successions of the *Macedonian* Kings ap. *Syncellum*, and

*Syncellus* himself grant him 30 years, and *Syncellus* says that he was 18 years before the first Olympiad (or, if we will believe the marginal correction, he was 25 years before it.) *Solinus* c. 6. writes that *Perdiccas* succeeded *Caranus*, or was first named King in the 22<sup>d</sup> Olympiad, but *Eusebius* refers the beginning of his reign to the 11<sup>th</sup> Olympiad. In that succession of the *Macedonian* Kings which we have in the Text ap. *Syncellum* p. 262, *Perdiccas* is omitted. As also the other Succession in the Margin doth not altogether agree with *Syncellus*, much less with *Eusebius*. To *Cannus* it allots 28 years; but *Syncellus* gives him 29, *Eusebius* only 12. To *Argem* it gives An. 34, *Syncellus* only 32; but *Eusebius* 38. To *Tyrimmas* it assigns An. 45. to *Perdiccas* 48. to *Philip*. 35. and to *Aeropas* 23: when *Eusebius* gives to the first of these 38, to the 2<sup>d</sup> 51, to the 3<sup>d</sup> 38, to the 4<sup>th</sup> 26.

The uncertainty of Chronology as to the Kingdoms that were in the time of the first Monarchy hath appear'd sufficiently. I proceed now to persons and occurrences which were in the time of that Monarchy; but the particular time when they liv'd or happen'd is very uncertain. I begin with persons, as

1. *Prometheus*, who according to *S<sup>t</sup> August.* de Civ. Dei l. 18. c. 8. liv'd when *Orthopolis* was



was King of the *Sicyonians*, and *Crius* King of the *Argives*. *Tatianus* and *Clemens Alexand.* *Strom.* 1. say that he liv'd in the time of *Triopas* who also reign'd over the *Argives*. *Eusebius* says that some write that he was in the time of *Rhorbas* who reign'd at *Argos* between *Crius* and *Triopas*; yet adds that others refer him to the time of *Cecrops* who was contemporary to *Triopas*, and that according to others he liv'd 60 or 90 years before *Cecrops*.

2. *Hercules*. According to the computation which we have in *Clemens Alexand.* *Strom.* 1. *Hercules*'s institution of Olympick games preceded that of *Iphitus* *An.* 440. or above, but according to *Eusebius* from *Hercules* his instituting them to the first Olympiad were only *An.* 430. *Velleius Patere.* l. 1. makes *Hercules* to have dy'd above 40 years before that *Troy* was taken, but by *Eusebius*'s account he dy'd but about 16 years before the taking of it. By *Eusebius*'s account also *Hercules* dy'd after *Eurystheus*, whereas our best Historians say that *Eurystheus* surviv'd him. *Diodorus Sicul.* l. 4. writes that after *Hercules* his death *Eurystheus* desired to expel his Sons out of *Greece*, and they gave him battle and vanquish'd him, and *Hyllus* one of them slew him. *Thucydides* l. 1. testifies likewise that *Eurystheus* was slain by them.

3. *Lycurgus*. Of *Lycurgus* (says *Plutarch* in his life) nothing can be said which is certain and unquestionable, but there is the least agreement about the time when he liv'd. *Aristotle* and others say that he liv'd at the same time with *Iphitus*, and was assistant to him in ordering the Olympick games. *Eratosthenes* and *Apollodorus* say that he was Ancienter by not a few years then the first Olympiad. *Timaeus* will have him to have been not far from the time of *Homer*, and some say that he conversed with *Homer*. *Xenophon* makes him to have been about the time of the *Heraclide*, and he seems to speak of those first *Heraclide* that liv'd not long after *Hercules* himself. Thus *Plutarch*. And as to *Eratosthenes* he ap. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* 1. declares the time from *Lycurgus*'s Tuition to the first Olympiad to have been 108 years. *Tatianus* says that he made his Laws 100 years before the Olympiads. But *Clemens Alex.* will have him to have been 150 years before them.

4. *Homer*. It is vulgarly known how various opinions there are about the age of *Homer*. *Tatianus* long since collected some of them. *Crates* (says he) will have him to have flourished before the return of the *Heraclide* within 80 years after the war of *Troy*, *Eratosthenes* after 100 years from the taking *Troy*, *Aristarchus* about the *Ionick* migration after  
An.

An. 140. from the fall of *Troy*, *Philochorus* after the *Ionick* migration *Archippus* being *Archeon* at *Athens* An. 180. after the destruction of *Troy*. *Apollodorus* reckons 100 years after the *Ionick* migration, and so 240 after *Troy*. Some say that he was a little before the *Olympiads* An 400. (or 407.) after the fall of *Troy*. Others make him contemporary to *Archilochus*, who was about the 23<sup>d</sup> *Olympiad*, in the time of *Gyges* King of the *Lydians*, 500 years after that *Troy* was destroy'd. Thus far *Tatianus*. They that desire more to this purpose may consult *Clemens Alex. Strom. 1.*

5. *Hesiod*. The like uncertainty there is as to the age wherein *Hesiod* liv'd. *A. Gellius* l. 3. c. 11. hath taken notice of the dispute concerning *Homer* and him, some making *Homer* the more Ancient, as *Philochorus* and *Xenophanes*; others giving the seniority to *Hesiod*, as *Accius* and *Ephorus*; others making them contemporaries, as *Varro*. Thus *Gellius* who l. 17. c. 1. determines that either they liv'd almost at the same time, or that *Homer* was somewhat the Ancienter. The truth is there are many besides those mention'd by *Gellius* that make *Homer* the more Ancient, yea *Velleius Paterculus* l. 1. makes *Hesiod* about 120 years later then the age of *Homer*: but on the other side according to the *Marmor Arundel*. *Homer* was by some years later then

*Hesiod. Cassius ap. Gellium l. 17. c. 2.* says that *Homer* and *Hesiod* were above 160 years after the *Trajan* war, but the *Marmor Arundel.* makes *Homer* to have been above *An.* 300 after the taking of *Troy*; and if you value *Herodotus's* opinion *l. 2. c. 53.* *Hesiod* and *Homer* were no more then *An.* 400 before his own time, *Cornelius Nepos ap. Gellium* says that *Homer* was but *An.* 160 before the building *Rome.*

Hitherto we have taken a view of Kingdoms and some illustrious persons that were in the time of the *Assyrian* Monarchy. It remains that we take notice of some remarkable occurrences that were in the same time, as

1, The flood of *Ogyges.* *S. Aug. de civ. Dei l. 18. c. 8.* observes that *Historians* are not agreed what time *Ogyges* himself was. *Syncellus p. 148.* says that some refer the flood to the time of *Phoroneus* King of the *Argives*, others to the time of *Apis* the successor of *Phoroneus.* *Africanus ap. Euseb. de prepar. Evang. l. 10. c. 10.* writes that it happen'd in the first of the 1020 years which were from *Ogyges* to the first *Olympiad*; whereas according to *Eusebius* there were but about 987 years from this flood to the first *Olympiad.* *Censorinus c. 21.* seems to make it to have been above 800 years before the first *Olympiad.* From *Ogyges's* flood (says he) to the reign of



of *Inachus* were about 400 years, from thence to the first Olympiad somewhat more then 400.

2. *Deucalions* flood. According to *Solinus* c. 11. there were 600 years from the flood of *Ogyges* to this of *Deucalion*, according to *Eusebius* *An.* 237, according to *Orosius* l. 1. c. 7 and 9, *An.* 230. *S. August.* de civ. Dei l. 18. c. 10. takes notice that *Eusebius* and *S. Hierome* refer this of *Deucalion* to the time of *Cecrops*, but that *Varro* refers it to the time of *Cranus* who was successor to *Cecrops*, and he might have added that *Justin* l. 2. c. 6. says that it was in the reign of *Amphictyon* who succeeded *Cranus*.

3. The taking of *Troy*. *Censorinus* c. 21. hath these words, *Sosibius* indeed did write that there were 395, But *Eratosthenes* 407, *Ti. Arctus* 514, and besides these many have written diversly, whose very dissent doth declare that the thing is uncertain. Thus *Censorinus*. Now what it is about which there were so many different opinions is not clear. It may seem to be the time from the reign of *Inachus* (what *Inachus* I know not) to the first Olympiad. But learned men have thought that he intended this of the time from the taking of *Troy* to the first Olympiad, it being well known that *Eratosthenes* makes the time from the taking *Troy* to the first Olympiad

piad to have been just that number of years which *Censorinus* mentions, viz. 407. However it be as to this, yea let it be supposed that those Learned men were mistaken in thinking that *Censorinus* refer'd to the taking of *Troy* in this passage; yet it cannot be deny'd that it is a considerable Testimony of the uncertainty of Chronology, and we shall sufficiently manifest the incertitude of the time when *Troy* was taken from other Authors. *Velleius Paterc. l. 1.* makes it to have been *An. 414* or *415* before the first Olympiad (not only 407 as *Eratosthenes*) *Solinus c. 1. An. 408*, *Eusebius 406* (in some Editions 405.) Very Learned men interpret the *Marmor Arundel.* so that it makes the interval twi'xt the taking of *Troy* and the first Olympiad to have been *An. 434*. As also they so interpret *Dicaarchus ap. Apollonii Scholaster l. 4. ver. 272. Argonaut.*, that he makes it to have been *An. 436*: for when *Dicaarchus* says (From the reign of *Nilus* to the first Olympiad *An. 436*) they by the reign of *Nilus* understand the time of the Trojan war, as perhaps by the reign of *Inachus* in *Censorinus* the same may be understood. Add hereto that the *Marmor Arundel.* makes *Troy* to have been taken *An. 373* after the beginning of the reign of *Cecrops*, and in the 2<sup>d</sup> year of *Menestheus*; whereas by *Eusebius's* account it was taken *An. 375* after the  
be-

beginning of *Cecrops*, and in the 23<sup>d</sup> year of *Menestheus*; and by *Syncellus*'s it was taken *An.* 385 after the beginning of *Cecrops*, and in the 33<sup>d</sup> of *Menestheus*. Also the *Marmor Arundel.* computes *An.* 320 from *Deucalions* flood to the taking of *Troy*, but in *Clemens Alex. Strom.* 1. the very same number of years is assign'd from *Deucalions* flood to the rape of *Hellen* by *Paris*; now according to *Homer Iliad.* *ω. ver.* 765. there were 20 years between that rape of *Helen* and the taking of *Troy*, and consequently from the flood of *Deucalion* to the taking of it there were *An.* 340 according to *Clem. Alex.*, so that his computation exceeds that of the *Marble An.* 20. From the taking of *Troy* to the building of *Rome* were *An.* 432, so *Dionysius Halic.* 1. 2. *An.* 433 says *Solinus* c. 1. *An.* 437 according to *Velleius Patere.* 1. 1. I might take notice that *Clemens Alex.* writes how some refer *Troys* being taken to the first year of *Demophoans* reigning at *Athens*, as well as others refer it to the last year that *Menestheus* reign'd there, as also that *Constantinus Manasses* makes the *Trojan* war to have been in *David's* time (saying that *Priamus* requested aid of him) whereas according to *Eusebius* it was in the time of the Judges, particularly when *Abdon* judged *Israel*: but enough hath been produc'd already to shew how great discord there is about the year when this calamity beset *Troy*. There is

is no less difference about the time of the year (whether it was in the Spring, Summer or Autumn) as also about the month and day (of which they that please may consult *Alex. Strom.* 1.) and therefore *Plutarch* in *Camillus* expresseth himself very cautiously speaking of the day of the month.

4. The return of the *Heraclide*. Which was 80 years after *Troy* being taken says *Eratosthenes* ap. *Clem. Alex.*, almost 80 years says *Velleius Paterc. l. 1.* By *Eusebius* it is refer'd to the time of *Melanthus's* reigning at *Athens*, but by *Syncellus* to the time of his Son and successor *Codrus*.

5. The *Ionick* migration or the passing of the *Iones* from *Attica* to that part of lesser *Asia* which is call'd *Ionia*. *Philostratus* in *Euphorbo* p. 702. says that it was according to some 124, according to others 127 years after the war of *Troy* that the *Athenians* sent a colony into *Ionia*, but *Eratosthenes* ap. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* 1. makes it to have been 140 years after the expugnation of *Troy*; for (says he) from the taking of *Troy* to the return of the *Heraclide* were *An.* 80, and from that to the *Ionick* migration *An.* 60. And *Strabo* l. 13. seems to dissent from them both, when he says that the *Alolick* migration was said to be 4 generations before the *Ionick*. Now 4 generations according to the usual account (that 3 generations are 100 years, see *Herodotus* l. 2. c. 142. and



and *Clemens Alex. Strom. 1.*) are above 130 years, so that the *Ionick* migration was according to this computation above 130 years after the *Æolick*, and the *Æolick* was some years after the taking *Troy*, yea according to *Strabo* above 50 years. For his account of it is that *Orestes* was the first Author of it, but he dying, it was carried on by his Son *Penthilus*, who came into *Thrace* 60 years after the war of *Troy*, about the time of the coming of the *Heraclida* into *Peloponnesus*. Thus *Strabo*. So that when *Eratosthenes* says From the taking of *Troy* to the return of the *Heraclida* *An. 80*, *Strabo* accounts only about 60; and when *Eratosthenes* computes from the return of the *Heraclida* to the *Ionick* migration only *An. 60*, *Strabo* speaks of 4 generations between the *Æolick* and it, and makes the *Æolick* to have been about the same time with the return of the *Heraclida*.

5. The building *Carthage*. It was 50 years before the expugnation of *Troy*, so *Appian de bello Punico*, only 38 years before it says *Philistus ap. Euseb.*, and in *Scaliger's* edition only 32. But very many say that it was after *Troys* being taken; *An. 143* after it say some, *An. 175* say others, *An. 338*, say others: these 3 differing accounts are taken notice of by *Eusebius*, and the account given by *Josephus c. Apion. l. 1.* that it was *An. 143* and 8 months after the building of *Solomons Temple*,  
will

will not agree with any of these. Nor will these that follow, viz. that of *Velleius Paterc. l. 1.* that it was 65 years before *Rome* being built, and *Servius's in Virgil Æneid. 1.* that it was 70 years before it, or *Justin's l. 18. c. 6.* that it was 72 before it, or lastly *Ti-maus's ap. Dionys. Halic.* that it was 38 years before the first Olympiad.

7. The first Olympiad. That is accounted the first Olympiad in which *Corabus* was Victor, and *Plegon in Fragment.* accounts that the 28<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, with whom *Aristodemus* and *Polybius ap. Syncellum p. 196.* seem to agree: but *Callimachus ap. Syncell.* says that *Corabus* overcame in the 14<sup>th</sup> Olympiad from *Iphitus. Syncellus p. 199.* says that the first Olympiad was the 45<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of *Uzziah* King of *Judah*, *Eusebius* makes it to have been the 50<sup>th</sup> year of that King; but *S<sup>c</sup> Cyril c. Julian. l. 1.* refers it to the reign of *Jotham* the Son of *Uzziah*, as *Africanus* did before him if we believe *Eusebius*; tho' *Syncellus p. 197.* would perswade us that *Africanus* refer'd it to the reign of *Ahaz* the Son of *Jotham*.

8. The building of *Rome*. Touching the uncertainty of the time when this City was built. I shall transcribe the words of *Solinus c. 1. Cincius* (says he) thought it was built in  
the

the 12<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, *Pictor* in the 8<sup>th</sup>, *Nepos* and *Lutatius* following the opinion of *Eratosthenes* and *Apollodorus* in the 2<sup>d</sup> year of the 7<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, *Pomponius Atticus* and *M. Tullius* in the 3<sup>d</sup> of the 6<sup>th</sup> Olympiad. Thus *Solinus*, who also delivers his own opinion different from all these, that it was built in the first year of the 7<sup>th</sup> Olympiad. They that please may also consult *Dionysius Halic.* who has collected many various opinions of both Greek and Roman writers about it.

I might instance in other occurrences, particularly in the Eclipse foretold by *Thales*, as to which they cannot agree either in what Olympiad or in what Kings reign it happen'd, *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 74. and *Eudemus ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* 1. saying that it was in the time of *Cyaxares* King of the *Medes*, but *Solinus* c. 16. and *Eusebius* in the reign of his Son *Astyages*: but I forbear.

All this time I have confin'd my self to the *Assyrian* Monarchy, and only observ'd how more ancient Writers disagree in their accounts of time, for it would be endless if I should go about to shew the discord that there is among our late *Chronologers*. Only it may not be amiss to represent how *Scaliger* is not only at variance with others, but oftentimes also with himself: and how his adversary *Petavius* is very unhappy in this respect as well as he is.

And

And in doing this I shall also confine my self to the time of the *Assyrian* Monarchy. I begin with *Scaliger*.

Troy was taken *An.* 408, before the first Olympiad, *Scalig. de Emend. temp. l. 1. de Período Asiático Edit. 2.*

Troy was taken *An.* 406, before the first Olympiad, *Scaliger de Emend. l. 5. de Illi excidio Edit. 2.*

The opinion that Troy was taken *An.* 407, before the first Olympiad is more certain by much, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de Illi excidio Edit. 2.*

Troy was taken *An. Período Julian.* 3533, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de Illi excidio Edit. 1.*

Troy was taken *An. Per. Jul.* 3531, *Scalig. de Emend. lib. 5. de Illi excidio Edit. 2.*

The first Olympiad was celebrated in the 36<sup>th</sup> year of *Arriab* or *Uzziab* King of *Judah*, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Olympiadum Edit. 2.*

The first Olympiad was in the 37<sup>th</sup> year of *Arriab*, *Scalig. A. nimadu. in Euseb. in An. 1241.*

The death of *Nabopolassar* was in *An. Nabonassar* 149, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nebuchodonosor Edit. 2.*

*Nabopolassar* dy'd in *An. Nabonassar* 142, *Scalig. in Fragment. p. 11. and in Capon. Isagog. l. 3.*

*Nabopolassar* reign'd only 19 years, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nebuchodon. Edit. 1.*

*Nabopolassar* reign'd 29 years complete and dy'd in the 30 of his reign *Scalig. in Fragment. p. 10 and 11.*

*Nabopolassar* dy'd in the beginning of the 29 year of his reign, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nabopolassar Edit. 2.*

The beginning of *Nebuchadnezzar's* reign was *An. Per. Jul.* 4107, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nabuchodonosor. Edit. 1.*

The first year of *Nebuchadnezzar* was *An. Per. Jul.* 4106, *Scal. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nabuchodon. Edit. 2.*

*Nebuchadnezzar* reign'd 7 years with his Father, *Scalig. de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nebuchod. Edit. 2.*

*Nebuchadnezzar* reign'd almost 13 years with his Father, *Scalig. in Fragment. p. 14.*

*Nebuchadnezzar's* death was *An. Nabonassar* 185, *Scaliger de Emend. l. 5. de initio Nabuchod. Edit. 2.*

*Nebuchadnezzar* dy'd *An. Nabonassar* 183, *Scalig. in Fragment. p. 14.*

These are some instances of *Scaliger's* uncertainty and inconstancy, with which *Peta-*

*vine*



*vius* frequently upbraids him, and had been the more excusable, if he was not guilty of the like himself. But his inconstancy will also appear by the following instances.

The Kingdom of the *Sicyonians* begun *An. Per. Jul.* 2548, *Petav. de doctrina temporum l. 9. c. 16.*

*Inachus* begun to reign *An. Per. Jul.* 2856, 179 years after the birth of *Abraham*, *Petav. de doctr. temp. l. 9. c. 18.*

The 7<sup>th</sup> year of *Pygmalion* was *An. Per. Jul.* 3822, *Petav. de doctr. temp. l. 9. c. 62.*

The first *Olympiad* was *An. 776*, before the birth of *Christ*, *Petav. Rationar. part 1. l. 2. c. 5.*

*Nebuchadnezzar* begun the siege of *Tyre* *An. Per. Jul.* 4122, *Petav. Rationar. part 2. l. 2. c. 13.*

The Kingdom of the *Sicyonians* begun *An. Per. Jul.* 2550, *Petav. de doctr. temp. l. 13.*

*Inachus's* reign begun *An. Per. Jul.* 2857, in the 6<sup>th</sup> year after the death of *Abraham* (i. e. 181 after his birth) *Petav. Rationar. part. 2. l. 2. c. 5.*

The 7<sup>th</sup> of *Pygmalion* was *An. Per. Jul.* 3825, *Petav. Rationar. part 2. l. 2. c. 13.*

The first *Olympiad* was *An. 777*, before our Saviours birth, *Petav. Rationar. part 2. l. 1. c. 11 and l. 3. c. 1 and 2.*

The siege of *Tyre* by *Nebuchadnezzar* begun *An. Per. Jul.* 4123, *Petav. de doctr. temp. l. 9. c. 63.*

To these we may add that *Petavius* makes one and the same year to answer to 3 several years. It is *An. Per. Jul.* 3961, in which he supposes *Rome* to have been built. This answers to *An. 752* before the birth of *Christ* (so *Petav. de doctr. temp. l. 9. c. 50.*) to *An. 753* before *Christ* (so in his *Rationar. part. 1. l. 2. c. 7.*) to *An. 754* before *Christ* (so in *Rationar. part 2. l. 3. c. 2.*) Finally in the end of his Books *de doctr. temp.* being about to give us the succession of the Kings in several Kingdoms he himself is pleased

to

to acquaint us, that he there gives an account of the beginning of the reigns of divers Kings somewhat different from that which he had given before in the Books themselves, and this more especially in the *Macedonian Kings*.

We see then how wavering and unconstant these Learned men are in their Chronology, and the great cause of their inconsistency is the uncertainty of it. This uncertainty *Petavius* acknowledges as to the time of the creation of the World. The number of the years from the Worlds creation to this time neither is certainly known, nor can be without a Divine Revelation. These are the words of *Petavius de doct. temp. l. 9. c. 2.* which may be appli'd to many other *Epochs*'s; about which Chronologers dispute with very great earnestness.

I have enlarged the more upon this subject, because of the great necessity and usefulness of mens being convinc'd of this uncertainty of Chronology of which we treat; which will appear, if we consider the many mischiefs which have been occasion'd by the want of such conviction. From the want of this have proceeded many eager disputes about matters appertaining to Chronology, and those manag'd with the greatest wrath and bitterness imaginable. If *Synellus* had been convinc'd of this uncertainty, he would have been more favourable

vourable to *Eusebius*, and not taken all occasions of reprehending him, and that many times in very rude and unbecoming language. Had others after him been throughly convinc'd of it, and seriously consider'd it, it would have prevented the heats between *Scaliger*, and the German Divines, and *Scaliger* would not have fallen so foul upon our Mr *Lydiat*, endeavouring to expose him, and triumphing over him with the greatest scorn and contempt. In like manner he treated all others that opposed him, or only dissented from him, inveighing against every one that did not fall down and worship every imagination of his; not sparing either Ancient Writers or Modern, but passing the severest censures upon both. The consideration of this uncertainty might also have prevented the scuffles between *Is. Vossius* and his Countrymen that set themselves so fiercely against him. Add hereto that if this uncertainty had been duly considered, the World would not have been burthen'd with many tedious and voluminous writings, such as *Scaliger's* two Editions of his *De emendatione Temporum*, and his *Canones Isagog. &c.* also *Petavius's* two Volumes *De doctrina Temporum*. Finally, for want of the consideration of this not a few have spent a great part of their life in the study of Chronology, and many of them men of extraordinary parts and great diligence; so that if the time and industry, which they

D

laid

laid out upon Chronological niceties, had been imploy'd in more useful Studies, they might have been very serviceable both to the time in which they liv'd, and also to future generations. Therefore seriously weighing these and the like mischiefs occasion'd by the want of such conviction and consideration, I thought that I could not do any thing more necessary and beneficial, then to endeavour to convince men of the uncertainty of the greatest part of Chronology.

## CHAP. II.

*Whether Lunar Months were in use with the Israelites before the Captivity of Babylon.*

**D**r. Cary part 1. l. 1. c. 12. singles a passage out of Arch-Bishop *Ushers* Preface to his *Annals*, in which he says that it cannot be proved that the *Israelites* used Lunar months before the *Babylonish* Captivity, but their year consisted of 12 equal months, every month having 30 days, and 5 days being added at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> month in every common year, 6 days every 4<sup>th</sup> or Leap-year. Thus the Arch-Bishop. The arguments wherewith the Doctor opposeth this are either from



from authority or reason. His authorities are

1. The Penmen of holy Scripture. 2. Other Writers. 1. The Scriptures which the Doctor produceth are *Num.* 10. 10. 28. 11. 1 *Sam.* 20. 1, 4, 5, 27, 34. 2 *Kings* 4. 23. 2 *Chron.* 8. 12, 13. *Psal.* 81. 3. *Ezek.* 45. 17. 46. 3, 6.

It is evident (says he) from one or more of these Texts that the Lunar month was in popular use, particularly from 1 *Sam.* 20. If you ask him how it is evident from one or more of these Texts, all that he says to this purpose is 1. That the beginnings of the months in the letter of the Law (i. e. *Num.* 10. and 28.) are interpreted by the *Psalmist* (*Psal.* 81.) to be the New moons. 2. That the *Septuagint* thought so doubtless, who use the word *νεμυρια* in these places. 3. That these Texts do certainly mark out the New moon to be a day of solemnity. 4. That the morrow after the New Moon is call'd the 2<sup>d</sup> day of the month. And now we have the whole strength of the Doctors argument from Scripture. To which I answer

1. None of those four propositions is evident, and consequently they cannot make it clear that Lunar months were in popular use before the Captivity. I grant that if the Translations of the Scripture were authentick, then three of the foresaid propositions would be evident, viz. all except the 2<sup>d</sup>: but if we must have recourse to the Original, then the other three are no more evident than it. For instance,

D 2

The

The first proposition is that the beginnings of the months *Num.* 10 and 28. are interpreted *Psal.* 81. to be the New Moons: now the *Hebrew* words for *The beginnings of the months* are ראשי חרשים *Num.* 28. 11. and the *Hebrew* word which is translated the New Moon *Psal.* 81. 3. is חרש, and to say that ראשי חרשים is interpreted by חרש is to say that an expression that is more plain is interpreted by one that is more obscure. But let it be supposed (tho not granted) that ראשי חרשים is interpreted by חרש, then we may say that the beginning of the month is interpreted by the first day of the month; for the first day of the month is called חרש says *Kimchi* both in his *Radices* and in his *Comment* upon *Psal.* 81. 3: and therefore instead of *Blow the Trumpet in the New Moon*, we may Translate it, *Blow the Trumpet in the first day of the month*. Thus it appears that the first proposition is not evident, and upon the very same account the 3<sup>d</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> propositions are not. For in all the Texts which the Doctor hath alledg'd for confirmation of those propositions (*viz.* 1 *Sam.* 20. 5, 27, 34. 2 *Kings* 4. 23. 2 *Chron.* 8. 13. and *Ezek.* 45. 17. 46. 3, 6.) the *Hebrew* word is also חרש, which in 1 *Sam.* 20. 27, 34. signifies the month (and is rendred so by our Translators) in the rest of the places it may signifie the first day of the month, or (which is the same,

same) the New month, though in our Bibles it is rendred in every one of them the New moon. So (to run over the Texts) we may read *To morrow is the first day of the month or the New month*, 1 Sam. 20. 5. *It is neither the first day of the month nor the Sabbath*, 2 Kings 4. 23. *On the first days of the month*, 2 Chron. 8. 13, and Ezek. 45. 17. 46. 3. and finally, *In the day of the New Month*, Ezek. 46. 6. So that it is the first day of the month which these Texts do mark out to be a solemn day, and the day after it is reckon'd the 2<sup>d</sup> day of the month: but it will not be easily made out that the New Moon is mention'd in any of those places. I acknowledge that this account of the signification of the word שבת doth not agree with that which the Doctor gives of it, but his account will be fully examin'd in the Appendix. It remains that I examine the Doctors 2<sup>d</sup> proposition, which is that the 70 who use the word νεομνία in all those places (*viz.* Num. 10. 10. 28. 11. and Psal. 81. 3.) doubtless thought that the beginnings of the months Num. 10. and 28. are interpreted by the New Moons Psal. 81. Now I deny, that this consequence is evident, or that from their using the word νεομνία in all those places it can be evidently deduc'd that they thought so as the Doctor says they did. We may rather conclude from it that νεομνία Psal. 81. signifies (not the

New Moon but ) the first day of the month. For the beginnings of the months are call'd *vesperna* or *vesperna*, Num. 10. and 28, and then why should we not think that *vesperna* hath the same signification Psal. 81. 3? But the word *vesperna* will also be considered more fully in the Appendix.

2. Suppose that it was evident that the New Moon is mark'd out to be a day of solemnity, it doth not follow that the Lunar month was in popular use ( which is the thing in question ) for the New Moon might be observ'd as a solemn day, on what day soever of their month it happen'd; though it fell out toward the middle or end of their month as well as if their month began with it. Again suppose that it was evident, that the morrow after the New Moon is reckoned the 2<sup>d</sup> day of the month 1 Sam. 20. 5, 27, 34. yet it cannot be thence concluded that the *Israelites* used Lunar months; for the morrow after the New Moon might fall out at that time to be the 2<sup>d</sup> day of the month, though at other times it was on other days of it. Thus his Text on which he chiefly relies, viz. 1 Sam. 20. fails him upon a double account, 1. It is not evident that the morrow after the New Moon is reckon'd the 2<sup>d</sup> day of the month. 2. If it was, the use of Lunar months cannot be concluded from it. This may suffice for answer to his argument from Scripture.

2. As



2. As to the Doctors argument from the authority of other Writers, he says that All the Doctors, Ancient and Modern, *Jews* and *Christians* ( except *Kepler*, *Petavius* and Bishop *Usher* ) were of opinion that the *Jewish* year after the *Israelites* departure out of *Egypt* was Lunar. Now what shall we say to this confident assertion? The least that we can say is, that it might have been expected that so great an undertaker in Chronology should have acquainted himself with Chronographers better then it seems he hath done. If he had more diligently consulted them, he would have found *Massaus* and *Temporarius* very positive for Solar years. It is manifest that the Scripture always every where useth Solar years and equal months consisting of 30 days, so *Massaus Chronicorum* l. 1. in fin. It cannot be doubted but that both in Sacred and profane History we are to understand Solar years, the days of every year being  $365\frac{1}{4}$ , so *Temporarius Chronolog. Demonstr.* l. 3. *Harvillaus* also in *Isagog. Chronolog.* l. 1. f. 11. p. 116. declares that he inclines chiefly to this opinion. I incline (says he) more especially to the 5<sup>th</sup> opinion, viz. (as he expresses it a little before p. 112, 113.) that till the Captivity of *Babylon* the years are to be understood to be Solar, consisting of 12 equal Solar months of 30 days with the addition of 5 days, and also of one more every 4<sup>th</sup> year. And finally doth not *Scaliger*

ger sometimes seem to incline to this opinion? as in his *De emendat. Temp.* l. 3. de anno *piscorum Hebraeorum Abrahameo*, where he says that always even after the coming out of *Egypt* there were 5 days added at or near the *Equinox*, as is sufficiently known by that which is disputed above out of *Moses*. And that moreover the first day of the month is called *וַחַד* which signifies *primus*, although there was no New moon on that day, no more then there was on the first days of the *Egyptian* months. Also a little before this he says that the sacred History testifies that *David* and *Solomon* did appoint 12 Officers according to the number of the 12 months of the year, see *1 Kings* 4. 7. &c. *1 Chron.* 27. 1. &c. The same *Scaliger de emend. l. 3. p. 637.* says that when the *Jews* received the form of the *Alexandrian* year and the *Calippick* Period, together with them they also receiv'd the *Lunar* year. Thus *Scaliger*, who in all these particulars *viz.* that the *Jews* receiv'd the *Lunar* year after the Captivity, that they superadded 5 days after their coming out of *Egypt*, that their year consisted of 12 months, and that they call'd the first day of the month *וַחַד* although the New moon did not happen on that day, no more then it did on the first days of the *Egyptian* months, agrees very well with *Arch-Bishop Usher*. It appears then that *Kepler* and *Petavius*, are not the only persons that

that have inclin'd to the Arch-Bishops opinion, and that it had been more prudent, if the Doctor had forbore that expression that all the Doctors except those two were against him. Thus we have consider'd the Doctors Arguments from Authority.

3. His Argument from Reason is very long, and they that would see it at large may consult the Doctor himself *Part. 1. l. 1. c. 12.* beginning towards the end of *sect. 5.* and reading on to *sect. 8.* I shall only give a Summary of it. He says that it is not deny'd that before Christs time the Lunar year was in popular use. If then we hold that they used the Solar year before the Captivity, 1. He says it is necessary that we shew when, in what age and by what means the change from Solar to Lunar was effected. 2. He wonders that neither *Josephus* nor any other did take any notice of it. 3. He affirms that the *Jews* would not suffer such a change. Now for answer to these.

As to the first, Why is it necessary to shew when and in what age this change was made, when the Doctor himself tells us that some have done it already? They set it (says he *f. 6.*) after *Alexanders* time, under the Government of the *Selencida*. Besides have not many innovations and corruptions crept into particular Churches, and yet we do not think ourselves oblig'd to shew the precise time that they first sprung up.

As

As to the 2<sup>d</sup>, Why doth the D<sup>r</sup> wonder that *Josephus* and others take no notice of this change, when he himself holds that after the departure of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* there was the same change of the year from Solar to Lunar, and yet they have taken no notice of that? The Doctor says in the beginning of *f. 15.* that when the *Israelites* were in *Egypt* their reckoning was according to the Solar year, but after their coming out of *Egypt* he maintains against the Arch-Bishop that they used the Lunar year; now where is this change taken notice of by *Josephus*? *Josephus Ant. l. 1. c. 4. and l. 3. c. 10.* says that they were commanded to keep the Passover on the 14<sup>th</sup> Moon in the month *Nisan*, and that *Moses* appointed *Nisan* to be the first month with reference to their Feasts and the things pertaining to Divine worship; but as to buying and selling and the rest of the dispensation of the year he made no alteration, but retain'd the first rite, form or order. These are the words of *Josephus*. So that if from hence that *Moses* appointed *Nisan* to be the first month with reference to Feasts, &c. and the Passover to be kept on the 14<sup>th</sup> Moon in that month, it can be necessarily concluded that he chang'd the year from Solar to Lunar, so that in saying the one *Josephus* in effect says the other, then indeed he doth take notice of that change; but if it cannot be certainly concluded (that  
Mo-



*Moses* made such a change) from those words of *Josephus* (as I am well assured it cannot) then he hath taken no notice of it. I have insisted upon this the longer because of that which the Doctor says *s. 5.* of *Josephus* and *Philo Judæus*. He says that they plainly signify that the year even of old time from *Moses* was Lunar, and imply somewhat more, namely this, that there was never any question made of it before their time. Now I would gladly be inform'd where they either plainly signify the one, or imply the other. I have produc'd *Josephus's* words already. *Philo Judæus de vita Moſis* having said that *Moses* made the beginning of the vernal Equinox the first month, adds, In this month about the 14<sup>th</sup> day, the Moon being about to be at the Full, the Feast of the Passover is celebrated, *Ἀγία ἑορτή* in the present sense, so that *Philo* speaks of that which was done in his time. Withal if he had spoken of the old time from *Moses*, he neither plainly signifies that the year was then Lunar, nor implies that there was never any question made of it.

The 3<sup>d</sup> particular remains, which is that the *Jews* would not suffer such a change. The Doctor useth many words to prove this, the summ whereof is this. The *Jews* (says he) believ'd that their ancient custom as to the time of beginning the year and observing the Pass.

Pasover was of Primitive Divine institution,  
 or bound upon them by Divine Law; and  
 therefore they would not suffer a change of  
 it. To which I answer, that if this be under-  
 stood more generally of their custom of be-  
 ginning the year with the month *Nisan*, and  
 observing the Pasover upon the 14<sup>th</sup> of that  
 month, it will be granted that they believ'd  
 it to be of Divine Institution. But if we de-  
 scend to particulars, as that the first day of  
*Nisan* or their New years day was to be al-  
 ways that day which answered to such or such  
 a day in our Calendar, or what other day you  
 please; or that the day of the Pasover was  
 always to be that day which answered (sup-  
 pose) to our 4<sup>th</sup> of *May*, I cannot say that  
 the *Jews* believ'd that this was of Divine In-  
 stitution, and the Doctor should have prov'd  
 it otherwise then by saying *Questionless they*  
*must believe so*. Yea, I could tell him that  
 some *Jews* have believ'd, that the precept  
 for beginning the year with the month *Ni-*  
*san* was only temporary, and did not oblige  
 them always to account it the beginning of  
 months.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the month Dioscorinthius, 2 Mac.*

11. 21.

THE month Dioscorinthius seems to have been *mensis embolimus in Anno Chaldaico*, i. e. a month superadded in the Chaldaean year, and interpos'd between *Dystus* and *Xanthicus*, in which month *Xanthicus* the letters from the King and the Romans to the Jews were written; so the Arch-Bishop A. M. 3841. The Doctor p. 84. falls upon him very insultingly for this. Upon consideration of the premises (says he) we may ask the question what then becomes of that conceit of Dioscorinthius as if it should be the Embolimæar month? Thus the Doctor. Now 1. Suppose it was only a conceit, why does the Doctor single out the Arch-Bishop as if it was peculiarly his? especially when the Arch-Bishop expresses himself so cautiously and modestly, saying only that it seems to be so. *Scaliger de emend. Temp: l. 2. de periodo Syro-Macedonum Alexandria Salianus A. M. 3891. and Menochius in loc.* are all of the Arch-Bishops opinion; yet we hear nothing of them, but the Arch-Bishop alone must be arraign'd and try'd, and the opinion (or conceit, for so the Doctor will needs call it,)

it,) condemned. Now if you ask upon what evidence or grounds the opinion is condemn'd, the Doctor tells us it is upon consideration of the premises; and if we would know what those premises are, we must look back to the beginning of the 25<sup>th</sup> section in that 84<sup>th</sup> page which I alledg'd above. Also that we may the better understand that which the Doctor would be at, we must observe that in 2 *Mac.* 11. 21. the date of *Lysias's* letter is thus express'd; The 148<sup>th</sup> year the 24<sup>th</sup> day of the month Dioscorinthius. Now the summ of that which the Doctor says is this, That according to his Tables the 147<sup>th</sup> year of the *Seleucida* was Embolimæar (as he calls it) *i.e.* a year in which one month was superadded. Yet (says he) according to popular estimation (and that very just and good) not the 147<sup>th</sup> but the 148<sup>th</sup> was Embolimæar. Then he adds in *sect.* 26. Whether the year 147 or 148 were Embolimæar it matters not, once I cannot see how the year 149 could be such; And I speak of the 149 year *Jewish* reckoning according to our Tables, which in the *Chaldean* account was the 148 according to the date of *Lysias's* letter 2 *Mac.* 11. Thus the Doctor. So that in short which year was Embolimæar he knows not, but resolves that the 149 or 148 according to 2 *Mac.* 11. could not be such, that he might conclude against the Arch-Bishop that Dioscorinthius was not *mensis Embolimæus*,



*mus*, a superadded month. But it may be said that the Doctor gives a reason why the 149 year could not be Embolimæar, because then the vernal New moon in the 150 year must be set over to the 15 of *April*. To which I answer, that (possibly) according to the Doctors Tables it must have been set so late, but who will regard his Tables, when he himself hath told us, that an account differing from that in his Tables, may be very just and good, and agree very well with the truth, tho not with the precise strictness (as he expresses it) of those his Tables? Besides his Tables have reference to the *Jewish* year, whereas the Arch-Bishop speaks expressly of the *Chaldean* year, and that which the Doctor calls the 149 *i. e.* the 148 in 2 *Mac.* 11. might be an intercalary year in the *Chaldean* account, tho not in the *Jewish*. Therefore the consideration of the Doctors premises does not perswade us to slight the Arch-Bishops conjecture so much as he doth. But

2. What if we should ask now What will become of the Doctors conceit, that *Dioscorinthus* was that month which is called *Διδυμῶν* or *Δαίων*? especially when we consider that it ingageth him to say that *Lysias's* letter to the *Jews* was of a later date then the Kings letter to them; the Kings letter bearing date *April 9*, *Lysias's June 16* after (according

cording to his reckoning) then which scarce any thing can seem to me more incredible. When the King himself had by letter certifi'd the *Jews* that he granted their desire, can any one imagin that *Lysias* should write above two months after, only to signifie the same thing to them? If the Doctor had only said that *Lysias's* letter to the *Jews* was of later date then the Kings letter to him, he had said that which is no less probable then the other is improbable. For I make account that *Lysias* first inform'd the King what the *Jews* desir'd, then the King writ to him to certifie them that he granted their desire (a copy of this letter we have 2 *Mac.* 11. 22, &c.) *Lysias* having received that letter, writes to the *Jews* as the King directed him, and his letter bears date the 24 of *Dioscorinthius*. Lastly the King himself writ a letter to the *Jews* dated the month following (according to the Arch-Bishop) *Xanthicus* the 15, which he sent with *Menelaus* (by whom also he had been acquainted with the desire of the *Jews*) to give them, full assurance, that he granted their request. In this there is nothing improbable. But that the King should give order to *Lysias* to write to the *Jews*, and that he should not do it till above two months or three months perhaps after, is that which I can by no means subscribe to.

To conclude, it cannot be determin'd certainly what month it was, whether *Dystro*, as *Serarius* thought, or *Dius* as *Grotius*, or *Dystro-Xanthicus* as the Arch-Bishop: but of all the conjectures which I have seen, the Doctors conjecture seems to be the least probable.

## CHAP. IV.

*Of the time when Artaxerxes Longimanus began his reign.*

THE Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3531 sets the beginning of *Artaxerxes's* reign 9 years before the received account. He was persuaded to set it so soon by the Testimonies of *Eusebius* and *Thucydides*. *Eusebius* says that *Themistocles* fled to the *Persians*, *Olymp.* 76. *An.* 4, and *Thucydides* accordingly refers *Themistocles's* coming to *Artaxerxes* to the time between the siege of *Naxos*, and the noble victory which *Cimon* obtain'd against the *Persian* at *Eurymedon*; also he refers the beginning of *Artaxerxes's* reign to the same time. For he says that *Themistocles* writ a letter then to *Artaxerxes* newly reigning. Thus the Arch-Bishop. Now it may be that he is singular in this opinion about the beginning of the reign

E of

of *Artaxerxes*, he himself insinuates so much. It must be granted also that the time of *Themistocles's* flight is not agreed upon, and indeed is one great instance of the uncertainty of Chronology. For *Plutarch* writes that *Ephorus*, *Dion*, *Clitarchas*, *Heraclides* and many more say, that *Themistocles* came into *Persia* in the time of *Xerxes*: but that *Charon Lamsacenus* agrees with *Thucydides* and affirms that he came to *Artaxerxes* his son, *Xerxes* being dead; also *Plutarch* adds that *Thucydides* agrees better with the Annals. *Cornelius Nepos* also follows *Thucydides*, tho' he was not ignorant that others were of a different opinion from him. But suppose *Thucydides*, *Charon*, *Lamsacenus* and *Cornel. Nepos* to be certainly in the right, in affirming that *Themistocles* fled to *Artaxerxes*, yet whether it can be infer'd thence that the beginning of *Artaxerxes's* reign was so soon as the Arch-Bishop hath set it, is another question, which I shall not take upon me to determine. I shall therefore only 1. Briefly shew the insufficiency of the Doctors answer to that which the Arch-Bishop alledges. 2. Take notice of an unbecoming reflection of his upon the Arch-Bishop.

The Doctors answer to the Arch-Bishop we have *Part. 2. l. 1. c. 11. f. 8. n. 1, 2, 3.* To *Eusebius* he opposes *Diodorus Sicul. l. 11.* by whom he says it is clearly asserted that the  
time



time of *Themistocles's* flight was Olymp. 77. *An.* 2, not Olympiad 76. *An.* 4. as *Eusebius*. To *Thucydides* he opposes the same *Diodorus Sic.* and *Justin*, who (as he says) clearly assert that *Cimons* victory at *Eurymedon* was in the time of *Xerxes*. As to *Themistocles's* letter to *Artaxerxes* he says 1. The date of it is not known, possibly was not known to *Thucydides* himself. 2. It is not without great suspicion that it was an *Athenian* trick, an invention of *Themistocles's* enemies, a letter framed on purpose to blast his reputation even after his death. 3. If it was true, it only evinceth this, that *Themistocles* lived so long in Exile abroad as to the time of *Artaxerxes* his reign. This is the summ of the Doctors answer. To which I reply;

1. It is not clearly asserted by *Diodorus Sicul.* that the time of *Themistocles* his flight was Olymp. 77. *An.* 2. He indeed speaks of it in that year, as he does also of his Ostracism and death. He thought it best to dispatch at once all that concern'd *Themistocles's* fall, and so in that year he gives us an account of his Ostracism or Banishment, his going to *Argos*, his flight from thence to *Admetus*, and afterwards from *Admetus* into *Asia*, his journey from thence to the *Persian* Court, and what befel him there, and lastly of his death. Not that all these fell out in that year, (for there was a considerable time from his

Ostracism to his coming to the *Persian Court*, and a considerable time again from his coming thither to his death) but it is *Diodorus Sicul.* his usual way to throw things thus together that belong to the same subject. As then from his mentioning *Themistocles's* Ostracism and death in that year, we cannot conclude that they fell out that year: so from the mention of his flight in that year it cannot be concluded, that it happen'd then. However, it is plain, that it is not clearly asserted by *Diodorus Siculus*, that the time of *Themistocles's* flight was Olymp. 77. An. 2, let the Doctor say what he pleases.

2. It is very true that *Diodorus Sicul.* and *Justin* do make *Cimons* victory to have been in the time of *Xerxes*, differing therein from *Thucydides*, and (as is probable) following *Ephorus*, *Dion* and others, who refer *Themistocles's* flight to the time of *Xerxes*: but as *Cornel. Nepos* rather believ'd *Thucydides* about the time of *Themistocles's* flight, because he liv'd near the time of *Themistocles*, and was of the same City, so may we rather believe him about the time of *Cimons* victory upon the same motives.

3. As to the letter with which the Doctor is so much troubled, 1. If the date of it be not known, how comes the Doctor to know it so well, as to be able to tell us that it is of the same date with the story of *Themistocles's* drink-

drinking Bulls blood? 2. Why says the Doctor, that possibly the date of it was not known to *Thucydides*, when *Thucydides* plainly tells us that *Themistocles* writ the letter after that he was come to *Ephesus*, being gone from thence into the midland Countries? 3. If there be so great suspicion that it was an *Athenian* trick, it is strange that *Thucydides* and *Corn. Nepos* ( who transcribes the letter from him ) were not aware of it. It must be acknowledged that the Doctor was very quick sented that could smell it out at such a distance, when those Authors which were much nearer did not. 4. It is most strange that the Doctor should say that if it be true, it evinces only this, that *Themistocles* liv'd so long as to the time of *Artaxerxes*'s reign. As if the writing this letter was one of the last acts he did, whereas he writ it ( as we have seen ) before his coming to the *Persian* Court, and consequently *Artaxerxes* had begun his reign then. Finally should we be so liberal to the Doctor as to grant that the letter is supposititious, he will gain little by it; for it is still apparent that *Thucydides* believ'd that *Artaxerxes* had begun to reign before *Themistocles*'s coming into *Persia*.

The Doctors unbecoming reflection upon the Arch-Bishop is in *f. 8. n. 4.* where he says that we must take notice that the knitting all these knots, and patching together those shreds,

as 1. *Themistocles's* courtly letter, 2. *Eusebius's* incongruous Annotation, 3. *Ctesias's* authorizing *ἄλλος Artabanus* nothing to the purpose, these are upon design to make a boulder for the Bishops interpretation of the 70 weeks of *Daniel*. Thus the Doctor. As if the Arch-Bishop foresaw that the Doctor would lay his interpretation to sleep, and so set himself to knit knots and patch shreds together to make a boulder for it. Or as if the Arch-Bishops design was to serve his Hypothesis, whatsoever became of the Truth. In the mean time the Arch-Bishops interpretation is that which very many Expositors, Ancient and Modern, have approv'd and follow'd, computing the 70 weeks ( as the Arch-Bishop doth ) from the 20<sup>th</sup> of this *Artaxerxes*. This 20<sup>th</sup> of *Artaxerxes* ( according to the Arch-Bishops calculation ) was *An. Per. Jul. 4260*, tho' it is represented here by the Doctor as if the Arch-Bishop made it to be *An. Per. Jul. 4261*. To conclude this, I wish the Doctor had not *Part 2. l. 2. §. 1. c. 9. f. 11.* after a profession of all humility, insulted with such contempt and scorn over many that have labour'd as much to clear the sense of that celebrated Prophecy of the 70 weeks, as he hath done to obscure and pervert it. See the 3<sup>d</sup> chapt. of the same Book and Section.

C H A P.



## C H A P. V.

Of the time when Sanchuniathon, Semiramis and Nitocris liv'd.

THE Doctor Part 2. l. 1. c. 18. f. 41. tells us, that the world is made to believe, that *Semiramis* was in the time of the Trojan war, or near thereabouts according to *Sanchuniathon*. This is that ἀντινομία and ἀναρχονομία of which he speaks in the same sect., which (says he) bears it self out upon the name of *Semiramis*, and the credit of *Sanchuniathon*. And in the margin he cites Bishop *Usher* for all this. Now it is true that the Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3789 will have *Semiramis* to have been in the time of the Trojan war or thereabouts; but I would know where it is that the Arch-Bishop alledges *Sanchuniathon* for this, or reports it upon the credit of *Sanchuniathon*. It is not *Sanchuniathon* that the Arch-Bishop alledges, but *Porphyry*, as cited by *Euseb. de Prepar. Evang.* l. 1. and 10, who says that *Sanchuniathon* was contemporary to *Semiramis*, and that she is said to have been either before the Trojan affairs, or about the same time with them. But let this strange oversight be past by. To *Sanchuniathon* and the Arch-Bishop the Doctor opposes *Herodotus*, who (as the Do-

For would make us believe in this §. 11) reckons *Semiramis* to have been 520 years after the siege of *Troy*. But if we read on and peruse the 12<sup>th</sup> sect., it will appear that he is not serious in it. For tho' here after having spent many words about it, he concludes, that this is most certainly the reckoning of *Herodotus*; yet there he says that it is not imputable to *Herodotus* but his transcriber, who writ *πεντε* instead of *πεντηκοντα*. The meaning of this is, that if *Herodotus* had indeed said that *Semiramis* was only five generations before *Nitocris* (as it is in our copies, see *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 184.) then the Doctor thinks that it would have follow'd, that by *Herodotus*'s account *Semiramis* had been 520 years after the siege of *Troy*: but (says the Doctor) our copies are faulty, and 50 being put instead of 5 we must read that *Semiramis* was Fifty generations before the other. The question then will be, whether we must follow our copies, or the Doctors correction, who produceth no other authentick copy to warrant it. Yea but the Doctor will demonstrate that this correction must be admitted. Let us (says he) rate these 50 generations by *Herodotus*'s rule (which is that 3 generations are 100 years) the product will be *An. 1666*. Let these be deducted from 4160 the age and time of *Nitocris*, the remainder is 2494. which falls just with the time of *Semiramis* her reign, the 35<sup>th</sup> year

year of her reign, according to the years of the *Julian Period* describ'd in our Scheme. These are the Doctors words, who triumphantly concludes, *This is a demonstration, I must insist upon it, taken from Herodotus, a demonstration that Herodotus is on our side contragenes.* And I would have given the Doctor leave to have been transported thus, if he had prov'd these three things, 1. That the age and time of *Nitocris* was *An. Per. Ful. 4160.* 2. That the word *γῆραι* in this place of *Herodotus* is to be taken in that sense in which three generations make a Century, 3. That his Scheme is a right Scheme. But if he fail in the proof of any one of these, what becomes of the demonstration, which he must insist upon, and which occasion'd such triumph.

1. The Doctor in his demonstration (as he calls it) takes it for granted that *An. Per. Ful. 4160.* was the age and time of *Nitocris*, whereas in *sect. 11.* he was more cautious, and only said it was about that year. And yet he brought neither Authority nor reason to satisfy us that it was about that year, unless his saying without doubt it must be so, be Authority enough.

2. He takes it for granted, that the word *γῆραι* in *Herodotus l. 1. c. 184.* is to be taken in that sense in which three generations are accounted 100 years, whereas it hath various significations, and we may observe in *Herodotus*

*dotus* l. 2. c. 142. where he says that three generations are 100 years, that the word ἀνδρῶν or ἀνδρώπων is still joyn'd with γενεαί, as γενεαί ἄνδρῶν, and γενεαί ἀνδρώπων, and γενεαί ἀνδρώπων γενεαί. Now this addition of ἀνδρώπων doth determine the signification of the word γενεαί, so that there it plainly signifies a generation of men. But here where the speech is of *Semiramis*, we have γενεαί without any such addition to determine its signification.

3. He tells us that *An. Per. Ful.* 2494. falls just with the 35 year of *Semiramis*, according to his Scheme. So that in the upshot all depends upon his Scheme, and if that will not bear the weight of the demonstration which he builds upon it, it must fall to the ground. His Scheme we have in the end of this 18 Chapter, and to recommend it to us, he says that it is *Africanus's*. But how comes it then that in the beginning of the Chapter he gives us another Scheme differing from this, and tells us that that is from *Africanus*? About the time that *Semiramis* begun to reign the difference between the two Schemes is no less then 25 years. But the Doctor solves this by saying that the one is *Africanus's* according to *Syncellus*, the other according to *Helvicus* and *Ricciolus*. So that it is questionable whether of them is *Africanus's* (if either of them be) but there is some reason why



why we should rather believe *Synerlus* then them, because he had greater advantages for knowing what was deliver'd to Posterity by *Africanus* then they had. Add hereto that *Helvicus* seems not to have valu'd the Scheme which he gives us as from *Africanus* so highly as the Doctor doth; for he gives us also another Scheme out of *Fustin*, and observing that *Fustin* makes the *Assyrian* Empire to have continued only 1300 years, he adds that this comes nearer to the Scripture, and again that it agrees very well both with the Scripture and with the *Ara Babylonica*. In a word, unless there was a better accord among Historiographers about the time of the duration of that Empire, about the number of the Kings and of the years that they reign'd, there can be no certainty either in the Doctors Scheme, or in any other whatsoever. It is plain then that he hath fallen far short of demonstrating that we must read Fifty generations instead of five.

By the way, the Doctor forgot to tell us that he was oblig'd to *Scaliger* (*fragment. p. 42.*) for this Criticism, or perhaps he was not willing to mention him for this reason among others, because tho' *Scaliger* thought that it should be Fifty generations, yet he differs from him in the conclusion; for he says that they amount to more then 1666 years, and being computed backward end in the reign

reign (not of *Semiramis*, but) of *Ninus* himself.

But it may be said, If we retain the usual reading, it will not help the Arch-Bishop at all, who makes *Semiramis* to have reign'd about the time of the *Trojan* war. For if she was but Five generations before *Nitocris*, and if *Nitocris* liv'd about *An. Per. Jul.* 4160, then *Semiramis* must have been 500 years at the least after the siege of *Troy*, since according to this account she was only 166 years before *Nitocris*, for Five generations according to the foremention'd rule amount to no more. But to answer this briefly, Suppose that all the rest was granted, the Doctor (as I observ'd before) hath not prov'd either that *Nitocris* liv'd about *An. P. J.* 4160, or that *νεκρῶν γενεῶν* in *Herodotus* amount to no more then 166 years. All his proof for the former is that, Without doubt it must be so. For the later he brings a rule out of *Herodotus* l. 2. c. 142. to which I have already answer'd that it is not necessary that *γενεῶν* should have the same signification in *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 184. that it hath l. 2. c. 142; especially when the word *αἰδῶν* or *αἰδῶνων* is joyn'd with it in the later place, not in the former. But further *γενεῶν* amongst other things signifies an Age, *Seculum*, (see the *Lexicon Græcolatinum vetus*) yea the Doctors great friend *Is. Vossius* says that it not only signi-

signifies an Age or 100 years, but sometimes above 100 years, *Imo etiam 100 aliquando uti est apud Theophrastum, vel etiam 110 annorum intervallum continet* yea, *ut docet Phlegon.* They are the words of *Vossius con. Horum Castigat. ad c. 6.* Now the word being interpreted in this sense, *Herodotus* says that *Semiramis* was 550 years before *Nitocris*, and so rather confirms the Arch-Bishops opinion concerning the time when *Semiramis* reign'd.

## CHAP. VI.

*Who Nabonasar was.*

THE Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3257. makes *Beleſis*, who obtain'd the Kingdom of *Babylon* after the death of *Sardanapalus*, to be the same with him whom *Hipparchus*, *Ptolemaeus* and *Censorinus* call *Nabonasar*. The Doctor *Part 2. l. 1. c. 17.* falls foully upon him for this, and yet hath very little to say against it. That which he doth say is 1. That there is a project in it, *viz.* to bring down *Sardanapalus* 100 years and more lower in time, then all Historians and Chronologers before did set him, 2. That he will not believe it. 3, That *Herodotus* hath no cover for

for this dish. Now for answer to these particulars, I need not insist upon any of them but the first. For as to the 2<sup>d</sup>, Tho' the Doctor will not believe that *Belefsis* was *Nabonasar*, this notwithstanding, it may be very true. And as to the 3<sup>d</sup>, We need not go to *Herodorus* for a cover, since the Doctor hath not discover'd any nakedness in the Arch-Bishops opinion. The first then only remains, in which the Doctor hath brought forth all the Historians and Chronologers that were before him against the Arch-Bishop; all these set *Sardanapalus* more then 100 years higher then he doth. To which I shall only say, that I cannot commend the Doctors prudence in using this large expression, *All Historians and Chronologers*, for I can affirm that there are some who do not set *Sardanapalus* so high as he pretends. *Bibliander* refers the beginning of the reign of *Sardanapalus* to the 25 year of *Amaziah* King of Judah, *S. W. Raleigh* to his 21, *Fanctius* and *Salianus* to his 20, *Tornicellus* to his 19, *Constantinus Phrygius* and *Bunting* to his 18, *Eusebius* to his 16, *Gordon* to his 13 or 14, *Simson* to his 20, *Syracellus* to the 7, and *Fretulphus* to the time of *Adariah* or *Uzziah* the Son and Successor of *Amaziah*, *Orosius* l. 1. c. 19 to the 64 year before the building of Rome. Now there is not one of all these that sets *Sardanapalus* more then 100 years higher then the Arch-



Arch-Bishop doth. According to the Arch-Bishop *Sardanapalus*'s reign begun 19 years before the building of *Rome*, and according to *Orosius* it begun but 64 years before it, the difference between them is only 45 years. *Freculphus* and the Arch-Bishop refer the beginning of his reign to the time of the same King of *Judah*, viz. *Uzziah*, and the Arch-Bishop particularly to *Uzziah*'s 44 year, and so they cannot differ above 43 years. They that make him to have begun his reign in the time of *Amaziah* do indeed set him higher then *Orosius* and *Freculphus* do, but *Syntellus* who goes the highest of them differs not above 66 years from the Arch-Bishop; for from the 7 of *Amaziah* (who reign'd but 29 years in all, 2 *Kings* 14. 2. and 2 *Chron.* 25. 1.) to the 44 of *Uzziah* there are no more, unless it be admitted that there was an interregnum. And it must be a very long interregnum of almost 40 years, to make the distance twixt the 7 year of the Father to the 44 year of the Son to have been above 100 years. Add hereto that *Bede* who refers the death of *Sardanapalus* to the time of *Uzziah*, and so the *Chronicon* at the end of *De la Hays Biblia magna* which refers it to the 9 year of the same *Uzziah*, do not set him more then 100 years higher then the Arch-Bishop doth. The same must be said of *Bucholzer*, who makes *Sardanapalus*'s his death  
to

to have happen'd *An.* 823 before Christ, when according to the Arch-Bishop it fell out *An.* 748 before him. Finally *Genebrard* and our *M<sup>r</sup> Lydiat*, who will have *Sardanapalus* to have been the same with *Esarhaddon* *Isa.* 37. 38. or *Affaradon-Pul* (as they call him) do bring down *Sardanapalus* many years lower then the Arch-Bishop sets him; for *Esarhaddon* did not reign before the time of *Hezekiah*. I may then safely conclude, that the Arch-Bishop had no such project to bring down *Sardanapalus* more then 100 years lower then all Historians and Chronologers had set him.

To return to *Nabonasar*, with the Doctors good leave I would ask the question, Why is the Arch-Bishop only quarrell'd with for holding that he was *Belesis*? They that please to consult *M<sup>r</sup> Lydiats Emendatio temporum A. M.* 3257 will find, that we were told the very same thing in express terms by him many years since.

C H A P.

## C H A P. VII.

*Of Darius Hystaspis, whether he was the husband of Esther, and of two of his wives Atossa and Artystona.*

**T**HE Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3483 and 3490. modestly offers some conjectures concerning *Darius Hystaspis*, as 1. That he was *Ahasuerus* in the Book of *Esther*, 2. That *Atossa* was *Vashti*, 3. That *Artystona* was *Esther*. For this he must not escape the Doctors lash *Part 2. l. 2. s. 1. c.* 4. notwithstanding that the Doctor might have known, that many learned men, as *Bertram de Repub. Jud. c. 13. Carion, Melancthon, Funccius, Bunting*, the Author of the *Chronicon in De la Haye's Biblia magna, Fevardentius, &c.* have thought that *Darius Hystaspis* was the husband of *Esther*, as well as the Arch-Bishop; as likewise that there are not many questions about which the differing opinions are so many, as about this; *Esther* having been married by one or other to most of the Kings of *Persia*, and to some of the Kings of the *Medes*. *Melancthon* also thought that *Artystona* was *Esther*, and *Atossa Vashti*.

As to the conjecture that *Darius Hystaspis* was that *Ahasuerus*, who reign'd from *India*

**E**

to

to *Ethiopia* over 127 provinces, *Esther* 1. 1. the Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3483 observes from *Valerius Maximus* l. 9. c. 2. that this *Darius* before he obtained the Kingdom was called *Ochus* *שחא*, to which *שתי* being added after his being King, he had the name *Ahasuerus*, as *Cambyses* had before him. And *A. M.* 3509 he says, that he is much confirm'd in his opinion by that which we read of *Ahasuerus* *Esth.* 10. 1. that he laid a tribute upon the land, and upon the Isles of the sea. This (says he) agrees to *Darius*, who was the first that instituted the paying of tribute, when they brought gifts before: (for which he alledges *Herodotus* l. 3. c. 89. *Strabo* l. 15. *Polyanus Stratagem.* l. 7. and *Plutarch Apophthegmat. Regum & Imperatorum*.) who also subdu'd and rui'd over the Isles in the *Aegean* sea (as he gathers from *Thucydides* l. 1. and *Plato in Menexeno*) whereas *Xerxes* after his overthrow in *Greece* lost those Isles, so that only *Clazomene*, and *Cyprus* remain'd under the dominion of his Successors, for which we may consult *Xenophon Hellenicwn.* l. 5. Thus the Arch-Bishop.

And what says the Doctor to all this? He dispatches it in very few words. For 1. The name *Ahasuerus*, 2. The dignification or title of being ruler over 127 Provinces, from *India* to *Ethiopia*, 3. The imposing tribute upon the Islands, all and every of these  
(says



(says he) did as much belong to the Kings of *Darius's* succession, as to himself in particular; therefore nothing can be concluded certain from hence in special for *Darius*. Thus the Doctor.

Whereunto I reply, 1. That the Archbishop never design'd to conclude any thing certain from thence, he knew full well that nothing can be concluded certainly in such difficult questions as this is. 2. How appears it that all and every of these did as much belong to *Darius's* Successors as to himself: the Doctors own saying it is all the authority or proof that is brought for it. Possibly some have said that *Ahasuerus* was a common name of all the Kings of *Persia*, but we are not obliged to believe every bold conjecture or confident assertion. And when the Doctor says that the being Ruler over 127 Provinces belong'd to *Darius's* Successors indefinitely, he seems to forget what he had said Part 2. l. 1. c. 20. viz. that *Egypt* (which was certainly one of the Provinces) did revolt from the *Persians* in the time of *Darius Nottus*, and was not reduc'd till the reign of *Artaxerxes Ochus*. And then, as to the imposing tribute upon the Islands, the Archbishop produces the Testimonies of sundry Writers to prove 1. That this *Darius* was the first that impos'd tribute (which could not belong to his Successors.) 2. That he sub-

du'd and rul'd over the Isles in the *Ægean* sea, which his Successors did not; for his Son *Xerxes* lost them upon his overthrow in *Greece*. But to all this the Doctor says nothing. I shall only add to that which the Arch-Bishop hath observ'd of this matter, that in *Herodotus* l. 3. c. 96. there is express mention of the Isles paying tribute to this *Darius*.

We are now to make tryal whether the Doctor be more happy in his arguing against the Arch-Bishop, then he hath been in answering his arguments. He objects against the Arch-Bishops conjecture, 1. That *Darius* was a name so well known to all the *Jewish* Writers, whether at *Babylon*, *Susa* or *Jerusalem*, and so appropriated to him that was the Son of *Hystaspis*, that it would be a very strange thing to see his name suppress'd by any of them. 2. That this *Darius* was an eminent Benefactor to the *Jewish* Nation from the first of his reign to his 6 year, and that it was his interest to confirm all *Cyrus's* decrees, and so it is not likely, that in the 12 of his reign he should so much forget himself, as at the instigation of a malapert Courtier to give commandment for the utter destruction of the people of the *Jews*, throughout all his Dominions. 3. That this Prince's levity in making ostentation of the Queens beauty, and peevishness in taking so deep an offence at her refusal, and petulancy in the use of many Concubines,

cupines, and lastly rashness in granting a decree for an universal massacre of the *Jews*, will not suit with *Darius*, who before he obtain'd the Kingdom had been one of the Seven Counsellors or Ministers of State, and was full 28 years old when he came to the Crown. Thus the Doctor.

Before I return answer to all this I must premise, that the Doctor is of opinion that *Artaxerxes Longimanus* was the husband of *Esther*. Now I say that these objections make as well against *Artaxerxes*, as they do against *Darius*. The Doctor himself confesses this to be true of the 2<sup>d</sup> objection. And as to the first, *Artaxerxes* is a name which was as well known to the *Jewish* Writers as *Darius*. For the 3<sup>d</sup>, the levity, peevishness, petulancy, rashness and cruelty in granting a decree for a Massacre of all the *Jews* mention'd in it will not suit with *Artaxerxes*, who is commended by *Plutarch* for his mildness or lenity, as well as magnanimity, and by *Diodor. Sicul.* and others for his prudence in managing affairs at the very first. So that the Doctor is oblig'd to answer these objections as much as we. Besides the Doctor is guilty of not a few mistakes. 1. I cannot understand why he says in the first objection, that the name of *Darius* was appropriated to him who was the Son of *Hystaspes*, since there were two other *Persian* Kings that had this name, viz, *Darius Nothus*

thus and *Darius Codomannus*; not to mention *Darius the Mede*. 2. I do not know how the Doctor will prove that *Darius* was one of the Seven Counsellors or Ministers of State before he obtain'd the Kingdom, especially when he was but newly come to *Susa* when the other conspirators against the *Magi* took him into their number; see *Herodotus* l. 3. c. 30. The same *Herodotus* l. 3. c. 139. tells us indeed, that he was one of *Cambyses* his guard, his *δορυφορος* or *satelles*; but adds that he was a man of no great note. 3. Suppose it granted that the levity, peevishness and rashness noted in *Abasuerus* did not suit with *Darius's* usual temper, yet when he was heated with Wine (see *Esth.* 1. 10.) that might betray him to miscarriages of this nature. It was therefore a mistake in the Doctor to think that he might conclude thence, that *Abasuerus* was not *Darius*. I add that if cruelty was one of *Abasuerus's* qualifications (as his giving commandment utterly to destroy all the *Jews* in all his Dominions must be confess'd to be an act of cruelty) no man will acquit *Darius* of that, who calls to mind his merciless slaughter of all the Sons of *Oebazus*, only because he desir'd that one of them might be permitted to stay behind, and not to accompany him in his expedition against the *Sythians*, *Herodot.* l. 4. c. 84. This may suffice for the first conjecture that *Abasuerus* was *Darius*.

For



For the two other conjectures, that *Atossa* was *Vashti*, and *Artystona* *Esther*, the Doctor objects that the agreement of the names *Atossa* and *Vashti* is of no moment against the authority of History and Testimony of *Herodotus*, who writes that *Atossa* was married to *Darius* after his obtaining the Kingdom, and that he had four children by her, and that she continu'd all the time of *Darius* to have a great power, yea all the power with him. How then (says he) is it likely that in the 3<sup>d</sup> year of this Kings reign she should be put away? And to say that *Artystona* was *Esther*, because the King had a greater kindness for her then any of his other wives, yea and that the *Persian* Genealogies were falsifi'd out of envy to the *Jews*, this (says the Doctor) is worse then saying nothing at all. To which I answer, that the Arch-Bishop doth not say, that the *Persian* Genealogies were falsifi'd out of envy to the *Jews*, but only that we may think either that the *Persians* out of envy dissembled the parentage of *Esther*, or that *Herodotus* had not rightly understood the *Persian* Genealogies. Again, the Arch-Bishop doth not insist upon the agreement of the names *Vashti* and *Atossa*, tho' it is true he thought as *Melancthon* also did that *Atossa* was *Vashti*: as he also thought with *Carion* and *Melancthon* that *Artystona* was *Esther*; and he was the rather mov'd to think so, because of

the singular affection that *Darius* bare to her, having her Image all of solid Gold; see *Herodotus* l. 7. c. 69. Now whether this is worse then saying nothing at all let others determine.

## CHAP. VIII.

### Of Ninus junior and Tiglathpileser.

**T**HE Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3257, declares his opinion, that *Ninus* the Successor of *Sardanapalus* mention'd by *Castor apud Syncellum* p. 205, 206. was the same with him who in *Ælian Hist. Animal.* l. 12. c. 21. is call'd *Tilgam*, in *2 Kings* 15. 29. and 16. 7, 10. *Tiglathpileser*, but in *1 Chron.* 5. 6, 26, and *2 Chron.* 28. 20. *Tilgathpilnefer*. This also is disliked by the Doctor *Part 2. l. 2. s. 3. c. 4.* and yet all that he says against it is, that there is just as much in *Ælian* to shew that this *Ninus* junior was *Tilgam*, as there is in the Scripture to shew that he was *Tiglathpileser*, and no more. His meaning is, that there is nothing either in *Ælian* to shew the one, or in the Scripture to shew the other. To which I answer 1. That there is as much in the Scripture to shew that this *Ninus* was *Tiglathpileser*, as there is in it to shew

shew that *Phul* was in a distance of some 85 years after this *Ninus*, which the Doctor confidently affirms in this Chapter. 2. Tho' there be nothing in *Ælian* to shew the one, or in the Scripture to shew the other, yet they may be true. The Doctor is willing to grant that *Tilgam* in *Ælian* and *Tilgathpilneser* in the Scripture are one and the same person, and yet there is nothing either in the one or the other to shew this. 3. The Arch-Bishop knew that there is nothing in Scripture directly to prove that *Ninus* junior was the same with *Tiglathpileser*, but the ground of his conjecture seems to have been this, that *Tiglathpileser* according to the Scripture was King of *Assyria* at that time, when this *Ninus* was King of *Assyria* according to Heathen Writers.

---

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the times of Moses and Inachus.*

THE Doctor *Part 2. l. 2. f. 3. c. 10.* says that it is fairly acknowledged by the Arch-Bishop, that it was the opinion of *Tatianus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Clemens*, *Josephus*, *Justus Tiberiensis* with others, that *Moses* was born in the time of *Inachus*, and that the  
migma-

migration of *Israel* out of *Egypt* was in *Phorons's* time. Wherein the Doctor hath represented the Arch-Bishop not much amiss, for *A.M.* 2179. he says that the forecited Authors believ'd that *Moses* was equal *i. e.* contemporary to *Inachus*, tho' it was the Arch-Bishops own opinion that the departure of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* was long after the reign of *Inachus*. But if the Doctor have dealt well with him in this, I am sure he hath not done so in that which follows. For he adds that All that which he (*i. e.* the Arch-Bishop) says to it is this, that his calculation, which he is sure is right, will not permit it to be so, *i. e.* *Moses* to be contemporary to *Inachus*. Whereas the Arch-Bishop doth not say this, and suppose that he had said it, it is not all that which he says.

1. The Arch-Bishop doth not say this. He doth not say, that he is sure that his calculation is right. He says indeed that the right account of times doth not permit us to doubt of this, that the departure of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* was much later then the reign of *Inachus*; but all that can be made of this is, that the Arch-Bishop thought that the account of times which he follow'd is right; that he was sure that his calculation is right, he no where saith. And yet if he had said this, it is not much more then that which the Doctor himself says in the first words



words of this Chapter ; I shall proceed ( says he ) a point beyond illustration, I shall go near to make a fair demonstration ; and again in this Chapter I doubt not ( says he ) but my deductions are as just as any other whatsoever, for they are deduc'd by manifest proof.

2. Suppose that the Arch-Bishop had said this, it is not all that he saith. For he shews how it came to pass, that those Learned men did believe *Moses* to have been contemporary to *Inachus*, viz. Having read of certain Sheep-herds that came out of *Egypt* into *Syria* about the time of *Inachus*, they understood this of the *Israelites* coming from *Egypt* to *Canaan* ; whereas those Sheepherds were the *Phanicians*, of whom *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 1. and l. 7. c. 89. with *Stephanus Byzant.* in 'Αλωτ. testifies that they came from the Red sea.

That it may not seem strange, that the Arch-Bishop should depart from the opinion of all those Learned men, I add that *Eusebius* did the same before him, as also the greatest part of our later Chronologers. But the Doctor adheres to their opinion, and will by all means demonstrate the truth of it, and if you will be so liberal as to grant his suppositions, and that his Deductions and Tables are right, then he may do something ; but if you be resty and will not grant him these, then you will put him out of the humor of demonstrating.

CHAP.

## CHAP. X.

*Of that Alexander King of Egypt, who was reported to have made the Commonwealth of Rome his heir.*

THE Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3924. affirms that *Alexander* who was expell'd by the *Egyptians*, and dy'd at *Tyre*, and was reported to have left the Commonwealth his heir, reigned at the least 15 years. And for this he alledges *Cicero* and *Suetonius*; see him also *A. M.* 3939 and 3940. The Doctor *Part 2. l. 1. c. 13.* takes notice of this, and though the Arch-Bishop and he were friends a little before in the very same Chapter (insomuch that he calls him the most Learned Bishop of *Armagh*) yet he presently takes up the cudgels against him, and denies that it can be prov'd by any Authorities alledg'd by the Arch-Bishop and others, that the foresaid *Alexander* reign'd 15 years. If it can be proved from any of them, the Doctor thinks it must be that of *Cicero Orat. 1 and 2 de leg. Agrar.*, but to take off the force of this, he urges those words in *Orat. 2 Hac L. Philippum in Senatu confirmasse in memoria teneo.* Which words seem to the Doctor to argue, that the Testament and death of *Alexander*,  
and

and the discourses of *L. Phillipus* in the Senate concerning them, were more then a year or two before *Cicero's* delivering those Orationes. Furthermore (says the Doctor) let it be granted that the death of *Alexander* was in the year in which the Arch-Bishop sets it; yet of the time of his expulsion, and how long he liv'd an Exile, there is not a word to be found in any of those Authorities. Thus the Doctor.

Who might have been more easily understood, if he had set down the passages in *Tullies* Orationes on which the Arch-Bishop relies, or directed us to the place where the Arch-Bishop hath transcrib'd them at large, viz. *A. M.* 3940. And his snatching at the words *Memoria teneo* (as if they argued that *Alexanders* death and the Speeches of *L. Phillipus* were more then a year or two before *Cicero's* delivering the 2<sup>d</sup> Oration) seems to me to argue that the Doctor was at a loss for an answer. For certainly a man may say properly enough, I remember or retain in memory that such or such things were discoursed of by such a person, though it be not more then a year or two since he discoursed of them. Also the Doctors saying that of the time of *Alexanders* expulsion there is not a word in any of the Authorities, doth more then seem to argue, that he had not consulted the Testimony of *Suetonius* in *Julio Cesare. c. 11.* alledg'd

ledg'd by the Arch-Bishop *A.M.* 3939, for it is manifest from him, that *Alexanders* expulsion was at the time of *Julius Cæsars* being *Edilis* (as the Arch-Bishop sets it) or very shortly after it.

But the Doctor also produceth the generality of Historians and Chronographers, and the Mathematical Canon against the Arch-Bishop. He cannot imagin why the Canon should omit a King of the direct line of 15 or 16 years reign, to substitute a stranger in the place of him. He concludes that allowing first *Cleopatra* and then *Alexander* to have succeeded *Ptolomeus Lathurus*; yet because the time of their reigning was short, under the length of a year, therefore the Canon casts it in to the reign of *Ptolem. Auletes*. Thus the Doctor.

But why doth he urge the Arch-Bishop with the Authority of the generality of Historians and Chronographers? when he had told us but a little before, that the Arch-Bishop did acknowledge the generality of Historians and Chronographers to be against him? Tho there are very Learned men that are for him, not only *Petavius de doct. item. l. 10. c. 46.* and in *Paralipomen. item in Rationar. Part 1. l. 4. c. 15.* and *Part 2. l. 3. c. 12.* but also *Ricciolus To. 3. p. 34.* and *To. 4. p. 82.* and before them *Paulus Manutius in Comment. in Orat. 1. de leg. Agrar.* As to the Mathematical Canon, the Doctor *Part 2. l. 1. c. 3.* acknow-



acknowledges that it is not free from imperfections and oversights, and therefore promisseth to rectifie the things that seem to be amiss in it. Withal he should not have told us that the time that both *Cleopatra* and *Alexander* reign'd was not the space of a year, until he had offer'd some answer to the Testimony of *Suetonius* alleag'd by the Arch-Bishop to prove that *Alexander* reign'd many years.

Instead of answering *Suetonius*, the Doctor takes upon him to correct *Justin*, who in *Prologo l. 39.* hath these words, *Ut post Laephyrum filius Alexandri regnarit, expulsoque to suspectus sit Ptolomæus Nothus.* Here (if we will believe the Doctor) *Justin* wrote not *Ptolemæus Nothus*, but *Ptolemæus novus*; for (says he) this *Ptolemæe* was called Διονυσίου, as *Diodorus Sicul.* testifies. But I would know of the Doctor, how we can conclude from his being call'd a new *Dionysius* or a new Διονυσίου or *Bacchus*, that he had also the name of a new *Ptolemæe*. I do believe that few have heard or read of a *Ptolemæus Novus* before this. And what necessity is there of making an alteration as to the name? since it is believed that *Ptolemæus Anletes* was really *Nothus*, with which agrees that passage in *Tullies Orat. 2. de leg. Agrar.*, where he says that he who reign'd then (i.e. as the Arch-Bishop and others interpret it *Ptolemæus Anletes*) was *neque genere neque animo*

*animo regio*, and I thought that it was upon this very account that the Doctor himself calls him a stranger.

---

## C H A P. XI.

*Of Argon who was the first King of Lydia after the Attyadæ.*

THE Doctor *Part 2. l. 1. c. 16.* falls very severely upon the Arch-Bishop, I must (says he) advise the Reader that he beware of being imposed upon by the allegation of *Herodotus*-----As if *Ninus* and *Belus* forsooth, the first founders of the *Assyrian* Monarchy, were the Grandchildren of *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitruo*, for it is that *Hercules* which *Herodotus* speaks of. And then (says he) who can chuse but wonder at that of Bishop *Usher* in his *Annals Part 1. p. 44.* or *A. M. 2781.* ) where this very *Argon* is made the Son of *Ninus* the first great *Assyrian* Monarch, and this grounded upon the Authority of *Herodotus*? And he adds that this was not a slip of the pen, but an industrious excogitation. After other words he thus concludes, That this *Argon* should be the Son of *Ninus* the Son of *Belus* founders of

of the *Assyrian* Monarchy credit *Judeus. Apella*,  
*non ego.* Thus the Doctor.

Whom the Arch-Bishop hath thus highly  
 offended only with these three words *Argon*  
*Nini filius.* He doth not say *Argon* the Son  
 of *Ninus* the first great *Assyrian* Monarch or  
 Founder of the *Assyrian* Monarchy. Nor doth  
 he say The Son of *Ninus* the Son of *Belus*,  
 though (if he had said this last) he had on-  
 ly transcrib'd the words of *Herodotus* l. I. c. 7.  
 which are these Ἀργων μὲν γὰρ ὁ Νινυ τῷ Βή-  
 λυ. Why then doth the Doctor talk of an  
 industrious excogitation, when the Arch-Bishop  
 says nothing but what he found in *Herodotus*?  
 But the Doctor says that that which he found  
 in *Herodotus* (particularly the words ὁ Νινυ  
 τῷ Βήλυ) is not *Herodotus* his own, but the  
 mistake of an unwary hand. In the Text of  
*Herodotus* (says he) it was not Ἀργων μὲν γὰρ  
 ὁ Νινυ τῷ Βήλυ τῷ Ἀλχαίυ, but Ἀργων μὲν  
 Ἰαργάινυ τῷ δούλ. ὁ τῷ Ἀλχαίυ. Now I think  
 that the Arch-Bishop is not to be blamed for  
 not being so profound a Critick as to discover  
 that *Herodotus* was to be thus corrected. And  
 if he was now living, I believe he would scarce  
 perceive, that there is so near an Affinity be-  
 tween γὰρ ὁ Νινυ τῷ Βήλυ and Ἰαργάινυ τῷ δούλ.  
 as that an unwary hand should write the one  
 for the other. I believe also that it would  
 have puzzled the most learned Primate of Ar-

much to construe this new Greek "Αργων υἱὸς  
 Ἰαργάνου τῆς δούλης τοῦ Ἀλκίου. Therefore  
 the Doctor hath oblig'd us by construing it  
 himself, viz. thus, Argon the Son of Alcans  
 the Son of a servant maid of Jardanus. Now  
 can any man possibly imagine that Herodotus  
 should express this sense in such Greek as the  
 Doctor would thrust upon us?

Therefore the Doctor is content that this  
 should pass only for a conjecture; he also ac-  
 quaints us upon what he grounds it, viz. up-  
 on this, that Alcans the Father of Argon is  
 by Diodorus Sicul. called Cleolaus ὁ καὶ  
 δουλεύειν νομίζων in the time of servitude born  
 of a servant maid of Jardanus, so Diodo. Sic.  
 l. 4. according to the Doctor. But 1. Dio-  
 dorus only says Born of a servant maid, he  
 doth not say Of a servant maid of Jardanus.  
 2. How appears it that Alcans was the Fa-  
 ther of Argon? Diodorus doth not say that  
 either Alcans or Cleolaus was his Father; and  
 Herodotus says that Argon was the Son Ni-  
 nus. 3. How appears it that Alcans is by  
 Diodor. Sic. call'd Cleolaus? The ground then  
 of the Doctors conjecture thus failing him,  
 and the conjecture being in it self very im-  
 probable (to say no more) he had certainly  
 done much better, if he had suppress'd both  
 of them.

The Doctor very confidently affirms, that  
 the Hercules of whom Herodotus speaks, who  
 was



was the Father of *Alcaus*, and according to the Doctor, the Grandfather of *Argon*, was *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitruo*. But *Heraclitus* doth not say that he was the Son of *Amphitruo*, and the Doctor doth not offer any proof of it. In the mean time this argument may be offer'd against it. If *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitruo* was born but a little before the *Trojan* war, and if *Argon* began his reign over the *Lydians* before that war, then it is not probable that *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitruo* was the Grandfather of *Argon*. But the former, viz. that *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitruo* was born but a little before the *Trojan* war, is expressly affirm'd by *Diodorus Sic.* l. 3. in *fin.*, and the Doctor himself grants the later; for in his Canon at the end of his book p. 43 and 45. he sets the beginning of *Argon's* reign 28 years before the destruction of *Troy*. This knot the Doctor is forc'd to cut, because it is not to be loos'd; and so let *Diodorus Sic.* say what he will, he sets the birth of this *Hercules* 85. years before the *Trojan* war; see his Canon p. 41 and 45. Also he would have *Alcaus* to have been born some short time after the *Argonautical* expedition, forgetting that which he says of *Alcaus* in the margin, that he is call'd *Cleolaus* by *Diodorus Sic.* and that *Cleolaus* was born in the time of *Hercules's* servitude viz. to *Omphale*, which was long after the

expedition of the *Argonauta*; see *Diodor. Sic.* l. 4. Add hereto that the Doctor makes *Hercules* to have been about 58 years of age when *Argon* begun his reign, whereas in *Euseb. Chron.* *Hercules* is said to have liv'd only 52 years in all, and that there were some who did not allow him so many. Lastly, the Doctor will have the expedition of the *Argonauta* to have been long before that *Eurystheus* first reign'd (see *Part 2. l. 1. c. 8.*) whereas *Diodorus Sic.* l. 4. p. 153 and 156. makes that expedition to have been long after *Eurystheus*'s first being King, viz. after that *Hercules* had perform'd the 8<sup>th</sup> task or labour that he enjoyn'd him. In these difficulties the Doctor hath intangled himself by holding that the *Hexcules* in *Herodotus* must be *Hercules* the Son of *Amphitrno*, whereas we may suppose him to be another (for *Diodorus Sic.* l. 3. says that there were three *Hercules*'s, and *Cicero de nat. Deor.* l. 3. writes that there were Six) and that the *Heraclide* that were Kings of *Lydia* descended from that other *Hercules*, but the *Heraclide* that many years after settled in *Peloponnesus* were the posterity of this *Hercules* who was the Son of *Amphitrno*.

CHAP.

## C H A P. XII.

Of *Ægyptus*, and how many years interven'd between him and *Sefac*, *1 Kings* 11. also whether he was the same with *Sethothis*; and of *Jonathan*, *1 Maccab.* 9.

THE Doctor *Part 2. l. 1. c. 20.* says that the Arch-Bishop makes 506 years to have interven'd from the beginning of the reign of *Sethosis* to the reign of *Sefac*, *1 Kings* 11. 40; but according to the Doctor only 451 years were between them. In this he relies upon the authority of *Africanus*, whose Numbers (generally speaking) he prefers before *Eusebius's*, whom (as he tells us) the Arch-Bishop follows, saving that with *Josephus* he gives four years more to *Sethosis* than *Eusebius* doth. But a brief answer to this will suffice. For as the Doctor only says that generally speaking *Africanus* is to be prefer'd (which implies that he is not always) so he himself in this very account doth not follow *Africanus*, but says expressly that *Africanus* may be rectifi'd as well as *Eusebius*. The Doctor pretends that he differs only two years from him, but take *Africanus* as he is represented by *Syncellus*, without *Goars* alterations,

and he differs above 20 years from him. Besides the Arch-Bishop is misrepresented by the Doctor, for the Doctor says that according to the Arch-Bishop, that interval of time from the first of *Sethosis* to the first year of *Sesac* was 506 years, whereas the Arch-Bishop makes it to have been 513 years; for according to him *Sethosis* begun his reign *An. Per. Jul.* 3223. (not 3230 as the Doctor would persuade us) and *Sesac* begun his *An. Per. Jul.* 3736.

In the very same Chapter the Doctor will not allow that *Aegyptus* was the same with *Sethosis*, as the Arch-Bishop *An. Per. Jul.* 3232 will have him to have been; but *Sethosis* was the Son of *Aegyptus*, if the Doctor be in the right. Yet the Doctor confesseth that herein he differs from several others as well as from the Arch-Bishop, and I am apt to think that in making *Sethosis* the Son of *Aegyptus* he is singular; neither *Eusebius* nor *Synellus* hath any cover for this dish, if I may use the Doctors own expression. Yea the Doctor contradicts *Eusebius* and *Synellus* as well as the Arch-Bishop, for they say that *Armais* was the same with *Danaus*, and *Ramesses* the same with *Egyptus*; but the Doctor supposes *Danaus* and *Aegyptus* to have been other persons, and of another family. As to *Sethosis* the Arch-Bishop transcribes the words of *Manetho ap. Joseph. c. Apian. l. 1.* who says that *Sethosis* was call'd *Aegyptus*,  
and



and his brother *Armais Danais*; who also distinguisheth *Armais* the brother of *Sethosis* from a former *Armais* that reign'd long before him.

The Doctor *Part 2. l. 2. s. 2. c. 1.* says that whereas *Josephus Ant. l. 13. 5.* writes that *Jonathan* received the Stole four years after the death of *Judas*, Bishop *Usher* roundly censures this as an oscitancy in him. Thus the Doctor. But I wish he had produc'd the words in which the Arch-Bishop roundly censures it as an oscitancy. Tis true *A. M. 3852.* he calls it an error, but withall as he tells us what led *Josephus* into that error, so he makes him so ingenuous as afterwards (*viz. Ant. l. 20. c. 8.*) to retract that which induc'd him into it.

## CHAP. XIII.

*Of the duration of the Assyrian Monarchy, and of Herodotus, also of the Median Succession.*

**T**HAT by which the Arch-Bishop hath most disoblig'd the Doctor is still behind, *viz.* his shortning the *Median Succession* by 167 years, and the duration of the *Assyrian Monarchy* by many more. For this the Doctor

Part 2. l. 1. c. 18. declaims most earnestly against the Arch-Bishop, calling it the modelling a new Chronology, and asking what *Scaliger*, *Eusebius* and *Africanus* would have said, if they had heard of this adventure, how (says he) would they have stood amaz'd? In this heat he runs on till he is out of breath, and not content with this he brings in *Is. Vossius* inveighing against the Arch-Bishop in like manner. At last he begins to think it necessary to give some satisfactory answer to *Herodotus*, on whom the Arch-Bishop relies; and in order to this he prays us to review that which he had written in the Chapter of the *Medes* (i.e. the 15. Chapter) foregoing. *Herodotus*, speaks of no Kings of the *Medes* before *Deioces*, and says that after their revolt from the *Assyrians* the *Medes* were *αὐτονομοι* governed by their own Laws. Accordingly the Arch-Bishop after *Arbaces*, who deliver'd the *Medes* from the *Assyrian* yoke, so that they were now free to live by their own Laws, mentions no Kings of the *Medes* before *Deioces*; see the Arch-Bishop *A. M.* 3257 and 3294. What says the Doctor Chapt. 15. to this? He says that because *Herodotus* speaks of no Kings before *Deioces*, we must not argue from thence that there were none, as we must not by the *αὐτονομία* of which *Herodotus* speaks, understand a perfect Anarchy, or that during that time they had no Kings at all;

all; for (says he) this is disproved by the authority of *Ctesias ap. Diodor. Sic.*, who mentions both the names of several Kings, and the years of their reign. And so *Chapt. 18.* it is noted as one of the Arch-Bishops mistakes, that by *Herodotus's* *αὐτονομία* he understands a perfect Anarchy. But what if the Doctor himself prove to be mistaken in thinking that the Arch-Bishop intended to conclude that there were no Kings only from the word *αὐτονομία*, or *Herodotus's* not mentioning any? *Herodotus* writes that Rapines and other lawless pranks growing more and more rife among them, some advis'd that they should set over themselves a King, that they might be govern'd by good Laws, &c. So they were perswaded to submit to Kings, and presently enter'd into consultation about the person whom they should chuse. Thus *Herodotus l. 1. c. 97, 98.* From hence I think we may safely conclude, that according to *Herodotus* they had no Kings at that time. 'Tis manifest that not only *Vossius Castigat. ad. c. 10.* but also *Diodorus Sic. l. 2.* did understand *Herodotus* thus, that they were without Kings. And as to *Ctesias*, probably the Arch-Bishop saw no reason why his authority should be prefer'd to that of *Herodotus*. This for the Median succession; only I must add, that the Doctor makes the Arch-Bishop to shorten it by 167 years, whereas the Arch Bishop makes the

the duration of it but 130 years shorter then the Doctor himself doth; for from *Arbaces's* freeing the *Medes* from the *Assyrian* yoke to the end of *Astyages's* reign the Arch-Bishop reckons 187 years, and the Doctor reckons only 317.

We now proceed to the *Assyrian* Monarchy, to the duration of which (from the beginning of the reign of *Ninus* to the death of *Sardanapalus*) the Arch-Bishop allots only 520 years, grounding himself (says the Doctor) upon *Herodotus*. And it is very true, that the Arch-Bishop alledges *Herodotus* l. 1. c. 95. for this, who in express words saith (as the Doctor translates him) that the *Assyrians* holding the sway of the upper *Asia* some 520 years, the *Medes* were the first that begun to break from them. But then the Arch-Bishop also alledges *Appian* in *Præfat.*, who says that the three greatest Empires of the *Assyrians*, *Medes* and *Persians* altogether did scarce make up the sum of 900 years. And what says the Doctor to this? He makes a short answer serve, saying that there is no weight at all in it as to the purpose for which it is vouched. But then he promiseth to give a satisfactory answer to *Herodotus*, in order to which he first sets down the words of *Herodotus* at large both in *Greek* and *English*, then he craves leave to note some mistakes, and at last he will bring the business to account.

As



As to the mistakes, the Arch-Bishop is only concern'd in two of them, *viz.* the first and the third. The first is, the Arch-Bishop supposes that the *Assyrian* Monarchy did expire at the time of the *Medes* defection. The third is, that he supposes that *Herodotus's* *αυτονομία* was a perfect Anarchy. To the latter of which it hath been answer'd already, that the Arch-Bishop is not concern'd whether *αυτονομία* necessarily denotes an Anarchy or no, for there are other passages in *Herodotus* (transcrib'd by me a little above) from which the Arch-Bishop might gather that the *Medes* had no King at that time, and it is the Doctors mistake to think that the Arch-Bishop concluded it from the word *αυτονομία* only. As to the other mistake imputed to the Arch-Bishop, *viz.* the supposing that the *Assyrian* Monarchy did expire at the time of the *Medes* defection, I grant that the Arch-Bishop doth suppose this, but deny that it is a mistake, for when so large a Province as *Media* was revolted from them, the *Assyrians* had not the Monarchy of upper *Asia* as before, especially when *Beleßs* had also obtain'd the Kingdom of *Babylon*. But they had still a large Empire or Government, as the Arch-Bishop tells us, making *Ninus* junior to have succeeded *Sardanapalus* in it. And yet the Doctor will prove that the Government was not extinguished, as if the Arch-Bishop had said

said that it was; whereas the Arch-Bishop says plainly that the Government was not extinct, tho the Monarchy was.

And now the Doctor will bring the business to account. He says that *Herodotus's* αὐτονομία begun about *An. Per. Jul.* 3000, and continued 1000 years; and yet when he descends to particulars he accounts but 800 years from the beginning of the αὐτονομία to the confederacy of *Arbaces* and *Belesis*, and 180 years after it, which two numbers do not make up 1000. But to pass by this, the Doctors meaning is that whereas the Arch-Bishop conceiv'd that the defection of the *Medes* and the beginning of *Herodotus's* αὐτονομία was in the time of *Arbaces*, he should have set it 800 years sooner about *An. Per. Jul.* 3000, and so the beginning of the *Assyrian* Monarchy 520 years before that, i. e. about *An. Per. Jul.* 2480. Now there will not need any long answer to this, since 1. The Doctor doth not alledge any Author that gives the least intimation of any defection of the *Medes* 800 years before *Arbaces*. 2. No man that reads *Herodotus* can think that he ever as much as dream'd that the *Medes* continu'd αὐτονομία the space of 1000 years. 3. These accounts do not agree with the Doctors own Catalogues of the succession of the *Assyrian* Monarchs, which he gives us in the beginning and end of this Chapter. From the beginning  
ning

ning of the *αὐτονομία* *An. Per. Jul. 3000*, or thereabouts to the confederacy of *Arbaces* and *Belesis*, he accounts a space of 800 years, but according to his Catalogues there were above 830 years between them. He makes the *Assyrian* Monarchy to have begun 520 years before the beginning of the *αὐτονομία*, which was about *An. Per. Jul. 3000*, so that we must set the beginning of the *Assyrian* Monarchy about *An. Per. Jul. 2480*: now the Founders of the *Assyrian* Monarchy he makes to have been either *Belus* or *Ninus*, and bids us reckon from either of them, but according to the former Catalogue *Belus* begun his reign *An. Per. Jul. 2378*, *Ninus* *An. Per. Jul. 2433*, according to the later *Belus's* reign begun *An. Per. Jul. 2353* and *Ninus* *An. Per. Jul. 2408*; now how will any of these accounts agree with the making the *Assyrian* Monarchy to begin about *An. Per. Jul. 2480*? Lastly, in this account the duration of the *Assyrian* Monarchy is made to have been but 520 years and 800 years or three or four years more, in all about 1320 years: but in the former Catalogue the duration of it from *Belus* to the death of *Sardanapalus* is 1460 years, in the later 1484 years; and from *Ninus* to the death of *Sardanapalus*, according to both Catalogues, above 1400 years. It seems then that the Doctor hath not brought the business to an exact account. Add that according

ding to the Doctor the *Medes* were *not* in the time of *Sardanapalus*, whereas *Diodorus Sic.* l. 2. plainly testifies that they were then under the Empire or Dominion of the *Assyrians*.

Therefore upon second thoughts in this very Chapter f. 13. the Doctor could be content to wave this answer, and pitch upon another, for which he is beholden to his friend *Vossius*, viz. that *Herodotus* hath been tamper'd with, and that he wrote 1500, not 520, as our copies have it. And I confess that this is a very easie way of answering. If we may at pleasure, without the warrant of any other copy, change 520 into 1500, and 3 generations into 50, and 30 or 35 into 40 (all which the Doctor doth in this Chapter) we need not fear any objection from the authority of any Writer whatsoever. I think that the Doctor had done much better, if he had wex'd both these answers, and either turn'd off *Herodotus* as he doth *Appian*, or rested in that which he says before that *Herodotus* was *fabellarum pater*, and not to be regarded.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XIV.

Of the duration of the Assyrian Monarchy against D<sup>r</sup> H. Vossius.

**I**S. Vossius in *Dissert. de atate Mundi* c. 5. says that all those that follow the *Massorites* Bible do make *Ninus* and *Semiramis* to have reign'd in the 38 year after the Flood. *Hornius* in *Dissert. de atate Mundi* c. 8. objects against this, that *Usher* refers their reign to *A. M.* 2737, so that they were almost 11 ages after the Flood. Hereupon *Vossius* in *Castigat. ad* c. 8. inveighs against the Arch-Bishop for cutting off at least 8 ages from the time that was from *Ninus* to *Sardanapalus* (making the whole time between them to have been only 496 years) and for omitting all the *Assyrian* Kings from *Ninias* to *Sardanapalus*, and this without reason or authority. To *Herodotus*, whom the Arch-Bishop alledgeth, and who saith that first the *Medes* began to revolt from the *Assyrians* when they had enjoy'd the Empire of the upper *Asia* 520 years, *Vossius* *Castigat. ad* c. 10. answers, that he is to be understood thus, *viz.* that when the Empire of the *Assyrians* had continu'd 520 years, the *Medes* began to revolt from them by little and little, and to become

a Nation *sui juris*, yet without Kings; and that *Deioces* was the first that invaded the Tyranny. Also to *Herodotus* he opposes *Ctesias*, who begins the Kingdom of the *Medes* not with *Deioces* but *Arbaces*, whom he makes to have possess'd the city *Ninus* and part of *Assyria*, whereas *Herodotus* writes that *Cyaxares* did this a long time after. Thus *Vossius*. *Hornius* in his *Defensio* c. 31. asks *Vossius* where he had his *Paulatim*, that the *Medes* did revolt by little and little. Then he alledges *Dionysius Halicarn.* l. 1. who refers the Empire of the *Assyrians* to the fabulous times, and says that the *Assyrians* possess'd a small part of *Asia*, therefore (says *Hornius*) it is false which others write of the vast dominion of *Ninus*, *Semiramis* and their successors. Also he alledges *Strabo* l. 11. who says that the Antiquities of the *Persians*, the *Medes* and the *Syrians* do not obtain much credit, because of the fabulousness of the Writers of them. *Vossius* in *Castigat. Auctario ad Effug.* 31. tells *Hornius*, that if he had considered the place in *Herodotus*, he would not have ask'd where he had his *Paulatim*. Also he makes *Hornius* to argue from *Dionysius Hal.* thus, If that Kingdom was in a fabulous age, then it was fabulous. Now (says *Vossius*) this is as if any one should say, The *Greeks* call'd all the time before the *Olympiads* fabulous, therefore the things that are

are written of *Moses* and *Sampson* are fables. He observes also that *Diodorus Sic.* relating the opinion of *Herodotus* sets down 500 years (not 520) and adds that he approves of *S<sup>r</sup> John Marlbam's* conjecture that in *Herodotus* we are to read 1500 years instead of 520, as he will have us to read in *Diodor. Sic.* 1500 instead of 500, otherwise (says he) *Diod. Sic.* would not have pass'd over that place in *Herodotus* without a reprehension. *Hornius* in *Defensionis Auctario* Def. 31. only remarks how prudent *Vossius* was in taking no notice of the place in *Strabo*, and how liberal in adding 1000 years to the Annals of *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Sic.*, as well as bold in correcting two Authors at once. I shall not take upon me to determine whether *Vossius* or *Hornius* have the better in this scuffle; only I observe 1. That *Vossius* not only takes no notice of the place in *Strabo*, but also he takes no notice of *Hornius's* argument from *Dionysius Hal.* viz. this, *Dionysius Hal.* says, that the *Assyrians* had the dominion of a certain small part of *Asia*, and this (as *Hornius* thought) doth not very well agree with that which others relate concerning the vast dominion of *Ninus*, *Semiramis* and their successors. And so from *Strabo's* words we may well gather, that no great credit is to be given to the long series or succession of *Assyrian* Kings which some give us. For by *Syrians*, *Strabo* meant *Assyrians*; so

*Herodotus* l. 7. c. 63. tells us that they are by the Greeks call'd *Syrians*, whom the *Barbarians* call'd *Assyrians*; and so *Cicero Tuscul. qu. 1. 5.* calls *Sardanapalus* King of *Syria*, whom *De finib. bon. & mal. l. 2.* he calls King of *Assyria*; and so *Fustin l. 1. c. 2.* *Assyrii qui postea Syri dicti sunt. 2.* That *Hornius* doth not argue in such manner as *Vossius* would persuade us, viz. The *Assyrian* Empire was in a fabulous age, therefore it was fabulous, but the argument should have been form'd thus, *Dionysius Hal.* refers the time of the *Assyrian* Monarchy, or part of it, to the age which is accounted fabulous, tis probable therefore that many things which *Heathen Writers* say of the *Assyrian* Kings, their number, names, &c. are fabulous. So that it is an odious comparison which *Vossius* makes, when he speaks of *Moses* and *Sampson*; as if because we are not oblig'd to believe every thing that is deliver'd in profane History, the like may be infer'd concerning the Sacred Records. 3. I think that *Hornius* had very good reason to ask *Vossius* where he had his *Panlatim*; for *Herodotus* only says that the *Medes* begun to revolt, he doth not say that they begun to revolt by little and little (as *Vossius* doth) nor is there any thing in *Herodotus* which intimates this. There is that which plainly intimates the contrary, viz. that they revolted together; for it follows in  
*Hero-*



*Herodotus*, that they gave the *Assyrians* bat-  
tel and worsted them, which they could not  
have done, if they had not all joyn'd their force  
together. 4. When *Vossius* in *Castigat. Au-*  
*thario ad Effug.* 31. says that the Arch-Bishop  
relies solely on *Herodotus*, I am tempted to  
question whether *Vossius* consulted the Arch-  
Bishop, thò he pretends to confute him; for  
it is apparent that the Arch-Bishop A. M.  
2737. alledges *Appian* as well a *Herodotus*.  
5. But that which is most strange is still be-  
hind, that any man should have the confi-  
dence to make such an alteration in the Text  
of both *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Sic.* as *Vos-*  
*sius* doth. He is displeased with the Arch-  
Bishop for shortning the *Assyrian* Monarchy  
without any Authority (for so he pretends)  
that he then should take upon him in such  
sort to correct two Authors at once without  
the Authority of any Copy either Manuscript  
or Printed, yea without any Authority what-  
soever, is the strangest thing imaginable. Cer-  
tainly this that the 1000 years which *Vossius*  
adds are not found in *Diodor. Sic.* where he  
transcribes *Herodotus*, is a stronger argument  
that they were not in the copies of *Herodotus*  
which he had, and so not in the ancient co-  
pies, then any that can be brought to prove  
the contrary.

It will be said perhaps, that it was not  
without either reason or authority that *Vos-*

*sius* made this Emendation. As to Authority, S<sup>r</sup> John Marſham in his *Diatriba* p. 35. had declar'd his opinion, that in *Herodotus* we are to read 1500 instead of 520. And then for reasons 1. It is plain that there is an error in the copies either of *Herodotus* or *Diodor. Sic.*, for when the one hath 520 years, the other hath only 500. 2. If *Diodor. Sic.* had found 520 in *Herodotus*, he would not have pass'd it over without a reprehension: thus *Vossius* in *Castigat. Auctar. ad Effug.* 31. But his principal argument is in his Answer to *Christiannus Schotanus*, and it is this; If we read 1500 in *Herodotus*, then he will agree not with *Ctesias* only, but also with *Dionon*, *Polybius*, *Thallus*, *Alexander Polyhistor*, *Castor*, *Diodorus Sic.*, *Africanus* and innumerable others.

To all this I return answer, 1. S<sup>r</sup> John Marſham did long since in his *Chronicus Canon* p. 489. in exprets words retract that which he had written in his *Diatriba* concerning the substituting of 1500 instead of 520, for (says he) it doth not agree with the mind of *Herodotus*. 2. As to the first reason, Suppose that there is an error either in *Herodotus* or *Diodor. Sic.*, it doth not follow that there is an error in both, as *Vossius* will have it. And if a careless *Amanuensis* left out 20 years in transcribing *Diodor. Sic.*, we cannot conclude thence that several *Amanuenses* should be

be so wretchedly careless as to leave out 1000 years, both in *Herodotus* and *Diodor. Sic.* I add that perhaps there is no error at all, but *Diodor. Sic.* thought it enough to set down the round number 500 years. To the second reason from *Diodor. Sic.* his not reprehending *Herodotus*, I answer, that it was his business only to report what *Herodotus* and *Ctesias* had writ, not to reprehend either of them. In answer to his third and principal reason I only say, that when we have substituted 1500 instead of 520 in *Herodotus*, he will not agree so well with the Authors mention'd by *Vossius* as he pretends. *Ctesias ap. Diodor. Sic. l. 1.* will have the duration of the *Assyrian* Monarchy to have been 1360 years. *Castor ap. Syncell. p. 168.* allots to it *An. 1280.* *Thallus ap. Theophilum ad Autol. l. 3,* & *Lactantium l. 1. c. 23.* affirms *Belus* to have been 322 years before the *Trojan* war. *Agathias de Imper. & reb. gest. Justiniani l. 2.* seems to say that *Alexander Polyhistor* writ, that from the beginning of *Ninus's* reign that Empire continu'd 1306 years. The same *Agathias* makes *Diodor. Sic.* to agree with *Ctesias*, tho' in our copies of *Diod. Sic.* he differs from him, saying that it continu'd more then 1400 years. *Africanus* according to *Helvicus* and *Ricciolus* allows 1484 years to the duration of it, but according to *Syncellus* only 1460. Now suppose that we

ought to substitute 1500 instead of 520, how would *Herodotus* still agree with these Authors, who do not agree among themselves, and who do not (any of them) come up to 1500 years? As to *Dion* and *Polybius*, I know not where it is that they speak of the *Assyrian* Empires duration, and as for *Vossius's* innumerable others, I do not know who they are. I conclude then, that there is neither reason nor Authority to warrant such an alteration in *Herodotus* and *Diodorus*.

I must not forget to take notice, that *Vossius* opposes *Ctesias* to *Herodotus*, and yet at the same time, wholly destroys *Ctesias's* authority in that which he writes concerning the *Assyrian* Monarchy, for (says *Vossius Castigat. in c. 10.*) tho' very much is attributed to his authority in the *Persian* affairs, yet he is a most lying Writer in other things. Besides, the instances which *Vossius* gives of *Ctesias's* dissenting from *Herodotus* do concern the Kingdom of the *Medes*, not the *Assyrian* Empire of which we speak.

I shall only add, that Mr *John Gregory* informs us of a Chronological Abstract in MS, which makes *Thourias* (who was also call'd *Ares*) to have succeeded *Ninus*, and after that *Thourias* he placeth *Lames*, and then *Sardapalus*. This *Thourias* or *Ares* (as the said M *Gregory* acquaints us) is suppos'd to be the same with him whom *Africannus* calls *Arius*.

See



See *Suidas* in voce *Θέας*, for it is evident that *Suidas's* *Thouras* and *Thourias* in the *MS* are the same.

## CHAP. XV.

Of the study of *Astronomy*, whether it be as ancient as *Nimrod*, and of the *Celestial Observations* sent into *Greece* by *Aristotle's* procurement.

**V** *Officius Castigat. ad c. 10.* says, that it is very absurd to think that the knowledge of the Stars is as ancient as *Nimrod*. For (says he) *Terah* and *Abraham* were the first that were skill'd in that science. Of *Abraham*, *Berosus* testifies that he was expert in it, and *Eupolemus* that he was the Inventer of it. And *Philo L. de Nobilitate* witnesses very clearly concerning both. The Arch-Bishop *A. M. 1771.* gathers from *Porphry ap. Simplicium l. 2. de calo*, that this science is as ancient as *Nimrod*. *Porphry* says that when *Alexander* had taken *Babylon*, *Calisthenes* sent from thence into *Greece* *Astronomical* observations of 1903 years. Now (says the Arch-Bishop) from the time of *Nimrod* (which was 115 years after the Flood) to *Alexanders* taking,

taking *Babylon*, were 1903 years, and so the *Babylonians* begun to make their Astronomical observations in the time of *Nimrod*. To this what says *Vossius*? He denies that *Nimrod* could begin to reign so soon as in the 115 year after the Flood. He says that the beginning of those 1903 years was almost 1000 years later then the Flood, in the 124 year of *Terah*, Thus *Vossius*. *Hornius* in *Defensione, Disserta. Def. 24.* answers, that *Berosus* only saith that *Abraham* was skill'd in the knowledge of the heavenly bodies, and that it doth not follow from thence that he was the Inventer of it, since he might learn his skill from the *Chaldeans*. *Eupolemus*, indeed, says, that he was the Inventer of it, but (says *Hornius*) he brings no Authority for the confirming his assertion. As to *Philo*, *Hornius* says that he favour'd his cause and Nation. He adds that the knowledge of Astronomy was before the Flood, and was deliver'd by *Ham* to *Chus* and *Nimrod*. And in his *Dissertation de Ætate Mundi c. 10.* *Hornius*, to shew that *Nimrod* might begin his reign *An. 115.* after the Flood, supposes that *Chus* was born in the first or second year after it, and that at the age of 35 he might beget *Nimrod*. *Vossius* in *Castigat. Auctor. Effug. 24.* replies, that *Abraham* could not learn Astronomy of the *Chaldeans*, for there were no *Chaldeans* at that time. And he tells *Hor.*  
*nus*

nus, that he is very absurd in making *Ham*, *Chus* and *Nimrod* to have been Astronomers, when he will not allow that *Abraham* was skill'd in that science. As to *Eupolemus*, *Vossius* says that he did not ascribe the invention of Astronomy to *Abraham* without authority, for *Berosus* and the *Egyptians* had said almost the same before him, adding that *Philo*, *Josephus*, and many of the Fathers do also confirm it. Finally *Hornius in Auctario Defens.* brings the Testimony of *Alexander Polyhistor ap. Euseb. de Preparat. l. 9.* who ascribes the invention of Astronomy to *Enoch*, as also of *Josephus*, saying that Astronomy and Geometry were invented before the Flood. And he tells *Vossius*, that *Kircher* had prov'd that *Ham*, *Chus* and *Nimrod* were skill'd in Astronomy by as good Testimonies, as he had produc'd to prove that *Abraham* was the Inventer of it. Thus far *Vossius* and *Hornius*.

I shall only observe a few particulars, as  
 1. *Vossius* says that it could not be that *Nimrod* should begin his reign *An. 115.* after the Flood, but offers no reason why it could not be; nor yet doth he give any answer to that which *Hornius* had said to make out the possibility of it. 2. When *Vossius* says that *Abraham* could not learn Astronomy of the *Chaldeans*, for there were no *Chaldeans* in his time, he meerly trifles; for *Hornius in Dissertat.*

*de aetate Mundi* c. 10. had plainly declar'd, that by *Chaldeans* he meant *Babylonians*, and would not contend about Names. 3. When *Vossius* says that the beginning of the 1903 years was almost 1000 years after the Flood, in the 124 year of *Terah*; he insinuates that the 124 of *Terah* was also almost 1000 years after the Flood. Now this will in no wise agree with his *Chronologia sacra*, for according to that neither the beginning of the 1903 years, nor the 124 year of *Terah* can be said to have been almost 1000 after the Flood, for both of them were above 1000 years after it. The 124 of *Terah* in that Chronology is made to have been 1186 years after the Flood, and the beginning of the 1903 years (counting backward from *Alexanders* taking *Babylon*) must be according to that Chronology about 1259 years later then the Flood. So that tho' *Vossius* disputing against the Arch-Bishop, will have the beginning of the 1903 years to have been in the 124 year of *Terah*, yet in his Chronology he makes the beginning of those years about 73 years later then that year of *Terah*.

But that which is most necessary is to examine the Authorities produc'd by *Vossius* against the Arch-Bishop, which I shall do briefly. The first is *Berosus*, who says, that in the 10<sup>th</sup> generation after the Flood, there was among the *Chaldeans* a just and great man,  
that



that was expert in the knowledge of the heavenly bodies; thus *Josephus* alledges him *Ant. l. 1. c. 8.* believing that the just and great man, of whom *Berosus* speaks, was *Abraham*. Another of *Vossius's* witnesses is *Philo de Nobilitate*, who says, that the Father of the Jews was a *Chaldean* by Nation, born of a Father that was skill'd in Astronomy; for that *Philo* testifies of *Terah Abraham's* Father, that he was skill'd in that Science; but that he doth there witness the same of *Abraham* (as *Vossius* pretends) I do not find: yet *Vossius* might have cited other places in which he doth, as *l. de Gigantibus* and *l. de Abrahamo*. *Josephus* is alledg'd also, who *l. 1. c. 9.* says, that *Abraham* taught the *Egyptians* Astronomy. The *Egyptians* themselves, and many of the Fathers, are also call'd in as witnesses. *Vossius* says that the *Egyptians* confess, that they learn'd Astronomy of the *Chaldeans*; but as to the Fathers, he tells us not either what Fathers should testify any thing, or where they should do it. Yet I freely grant, that some of the Fathers say as much as some of his witnesses do, as *S. Basil in Isa. 13.* who ascribes the invention of this science to the *Chaldeans*, and *S. Greg. Nazianzen Orat. 3.* who attributes it to the *Babylonians*. But now what do all these Testimonies make to *Vossius's* purpose, who should prove that *Terah* and *Abraham* were the first Inven-

Inventers of Astronomy, or the first that studied and taught it? Some say that *Abraham* had the knowledge of Astronomy, and one adds that the *Egyptians* learn'd it of him; as another saith, that *Terah* was skill'd in this science; but none of them say that *Terah* and *Abraham* were the first Inventers of it. Indeed *Eupolemus* ap. *Euseb. de Preparat. l. 9. c. 17* very plainly testifies that *Abraham* invented Astronomy, and instructed the *Phenicians* and *Egyptians* in that Science; but as he is but a single witness, so he withal affirms that *Enoch* was the first Inventer of it, and whereas the *Greeks* attribute the invention of it to *Atlas*, *Eupolemus* informs us that *Atlas* was *Enoch*. This concerning *Enoch* is confirm'd by the Testimony of *Alexander Polyhistor* above mention'd, and of *Josephus l. 1. c. 3.*

## CHAP. XVI.

Of the Egyptian Empire, when it begun, and how long it continued. Also of Constantinus Manasses.

**V**osius in *Dissertat. de atate Mundi c. 5.* says that the *Egyptian* Dynasties were some Ages before *Abrahams* time. But *Hornius* in his *Dissertat. c. 8.* tells him that this

is false. For (says he) according to the Arch-Bishops computation, the beginning of the Egyptian Empire was *A. M.* 1816, and *Abrahams* birth was *A. M.* 2008, so that that Empire was not full two Ages more ancient than *Abrahams* time. And yet within that space of time there might be several Dynasties. *Vossius Castigat. ad c. 11.* replies, that the Arch-Bishops computation relies wholly upon the Authority of *Constantinus Manasses*, and his *Putidissimum Chronicon* (as he calls it.) He adds that this *Constantinus Manasses* makes that *Abimelech*, which fell in love with *Sarah Abrahams* wife, to have been the first King of Egypt; how then (says he) can the Arch-Bishop prove from him that the Kingdom of Egypt begun almost two Ages before *Abraham*? Further, whereas that *Constantine* writes that the Egyptian Empire continu'd 1663 years, the Arch-Bishop errs in referring the end of that Empire to the reign of *Cambyzes*, for Egyptian Kings did reign after *Cambyzes* to the time of *Alexander* the great. Now let the time from *Abraham* to *Alexander* be computed, and the number of the years, according to the computation of the Greeks, will be found to agree with that which *Constantine* mentions. *Ensebins* makes the destruction of the Egyptian Empire to have happened 1666 years after *Abraham*. *Hornius in Defensio. 30.* rejoyns, that the Arch-Bishops computation doth

doth not rely solely upon the Authority of that *Constantine*, but also upon this, that *Mixraim* lead Colonies into *Egypt* about the time, when according to the Arch-Bishops calculation, the *Egyptian* Empire did begin. He asks why *Egypt* is call'd the land of *Mixraim*, if the *Egyptian* Empire was not founded by him. He tells *Vossius* that his Father did not judge *Constantinus Manasses* to be a despicable Writer, and that in *Janus Douza* his account his *Chronica* are *accuratissima* (not *putidissima*.) He adds that the end of the *Egyptian* Empire is by the Arch-Bishop rightly refer'd to *Cambyzes*, for tho' the *Egyptians* rebell'd afterwards, they were presently subdu'd together with their Kings. And whereas *Vossius* speaks of the time of *Alexander* the great, he says that *Ochus* recover'd *Egypt* 13 years before that *Alexander* was King of *Macedonia*. *Vossius* in *Castigat. Auctar. ad Effug.* 30. says that Eight *Egyptian* Kings reign'd successively after the time of *Cambyzes* (as *Diodorus* and others testify) and that *Alexander* was Seven years old when *Ochus* recover'd *Egypt*, and that *Ensebius An.* 1666 hath these words *Agyptiorum regnum destructum*. *Hornius* in *Defens. Auctar. Def.* 30. says, that when we speak of the time of *Alexander* the Great, we understand the time of his reign, or after that he came to be King. When he was a boy of the age of Seven years, he was not *Alexander*



*Alexander the Great.* Thus this matter was debated betwixt *Vossius* and *Hornius*.

I shall only remark 1. That *Hornius* hath rightly observ'd, that the Arch-Bishop was induc'd to refer the beginning of the *Egyptian* Empire to the time of *Mizraim*, not only by the Authority of *Constant. Manasses*, but also by that (which *Vossius* says that he never deni'd) viz. that *Mizraim* was the Founder of that Empire. 2. That I do not look upon it as a necessary consequence, because *Eusebius* reckons 1666 years from *Abraham* to the end of the *Egyptian* Empire, and *Constant. Manasses* reckons 1663 years from the beginning of that Empire to the end of it, that therefore *Constant. Manasses* makes it to have begun in the time of *Abraham*, and to have ended at the time when *Eusebius* says that it was destroy'd. 3. It is manifest that *Constant. Manasses* makes the Kingdom of the *Egyptians* to have begun before *Abraham's* time, for he says that it begun when there were only Seven generations after the Flood, and so according to him it begun before the time of *Serug*, for he says that *Serug* was the Eighth after the Flood. In like manner he says that *Abraham* and *Belus* were not many generations after the beginning of the *Egyptian* Empire, and doth not this plainly imply that *Abraham* was some generations after it? 4. I cannot

not sufficiently admire that *Vossius* should make *Constant. Manasses* to say, that the *Abimelech* who fell in love with *Sarah*, was the first King of *Egypt*, whereas he only saith that he was King at the time of *Abrahams* sojourning there. It is true, that he hath these words Παρ' Αιγυπτίοις βασιλεὺς ὡς τὸ ὑπάρχοντων: but 1. it is 9 or 10 verses before his mentioning *Abimelech* that he hath these words, 2. His meaning in them is only this, that a King was first in *Egypt*. That this is the sense of the words is manifest, for they are a repetition of that which he had said plainly before, that the *Egyptians* were the first that were governed by Kings, and paid tribute. And as some proof of this, he tells us that *Abraham* found a King in *Egypt* when he came thither, whereas the foundation of the Kingdom of the *Assyrians* was first laid in *Abrahams* time by *Belus*, so that there were Kings in *Egypt* before the Founding the *Assyrian* Empire. *Vossius* therefore did strangely mistake the meaning of *Constant. Manasses*. 5. If according to *Constant. Manasses* the Kingdom of the *Egyptians* begun some generations before *Abraham*, and continued only 1663 years, then (whether we follow *Eusebius's* account, or *Vossius's* own in his *Chronologia sacra*) according to him the end of it was before the birth of *Alexander* the Great. Lastly, all the time that *Vossius's* Eight *Egyptian* Kings

Kings after *Cambyfes* reign'd, is computed to have been not much above 60 years, so that *Hornius* did not erre very much in saying, that the *Egyptians* were presently subdued with their Kings.

---

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Of the Version of the Septuagint.*

**V***ossius* in his Epistle Dedicatory to *Slingelandius* prefix'd to his Castigations of *Hornius*, says, that the Arch-Bishop in his Treatise concerning the Version of the LXX doth endeavour to shew, that the true Translation of the LXX lay hid in the *Alexandrian* Library, not read and transcrib'd by any person; and at last perish'd in the fire which consum'd the Library it self. Thus *Vossius*, Now it is not doubted (as I suppose) but that the Original copy was laid up in the *Alexandrian* Library, and was consum'd there together with the Library it self: so that the only thing in Question is, whether *Vossius* doth affirm truly that the Arch-Bishop endeavours to shew that it so lay hid in that Library, as that it was not read or transcrib'd by any person. To which I say that the Arch-Bishop is so far from endeavouring to shew this, that

1

contra-

contrariwise he says plainly, that some Copies of that Translation were extant in the hands of private persons after that *Philadelphus's* Library was burnt, in the former *Alexandrian* War; which could not be, if that Translation had lain hid so as that it was not seen or transcrib'd by any. I shall produce the Arch-Bishops own words *Licet in privatorum manibus (post incensam priori bello Alexandrino Philadelphi Bibliothecam) veteris illius LXX Seniorum Versionis adhuc exempla extarent*; so the Arch-Bishop *De Editione LXX Interpretum* c. 3. Again in the same Chapter *Evanescente paulatim, quæ in privatorum tantum manibus habebatur, Pentateuchi à 72 Senioribus facta interpretatione*. Now if it so lay hid as that it was not copied out by any person, I would gladly know how private hands came to have Copies of it: I acknowledge that it is very usual with persons engag'd in any controversy to misrepresent the opinion of their adversary (as *Vossius* hath here misrepresented the Arch-Bishops) to the end that they may more easily expose it, and make it appear more absurd and ridiculous in the eyes of such Readers, as take things upon trust, not having opportunity, or not being willing to be at the pains of examining them: but what Apology can be made for so disingenuous a practice, I know not.



## An APPENDIX.

**T**Hough *Vossius* and Dr *Cary* were displeased with Arch-Bishop *Usher*, yet they both grant that he was a Learned man ; and his Annals, in defence of which I have presum'd to appear, and which I make bold to recommend to such as shall apply themselves to the Study of Sacred and Profane History, do sufficiently proclaim him to have been such. I acknowledge that several things appertaining to Chronology are interspers'd in them, but he doth not dwell upon them, or trouble the world with tedious and eager disputes about them : And if he go sometimes out of the ordinary roade of Chronographers, yet he doth not this out of any affectation of singularity, nor doth he passionately espouse his opinions, but modestly offers some conjectures to his Readers consideration, briefly hinting the Reasons or Authorities upon which he grounds them. In answering Dr *Cary's* objections against the Arch-Bishops opinion concerning the Months and Year which was in use among the *Hebrews* Chapt. 2. I promised more fully to examine what the Doctor saith of the word *שנה*, which promise I shall now perform ; and also I shall annex a brief examination of that which the Doctor saith *Of the men of the Great Synagogue.*

Of the signification of the words חַרֵשׁ and  
 ρεομννία.

**T**Hat which Dr Cary says of the word חַרֵשׁ we have in Part 1. l. 1. c. 12. f. 12. and it is this. One and the same word (says he) stands to signifie *Luna, Novilunium* and *Mensis*. The word in the *Hebrew* is חַרֵשׁ from רָשָׁה *renovavit*, to make new. *Hoc nomine non modo mensis i. e. 30 dies communiter & universaliter, verum etiam dies duntaxat primus Mensis, seu Calenda vocantur, quasi novitatem seu renovationem dicas, Græci ρεομννίαν dixerunt.* So Pagnin, Buxtorf, Schindler, &c. and R. David in *Lexic.* quoted by Petavius de *Doct. Temp.* l. 3. c. 22. *vocatur autem חַרֵשׁ quod luna renovatur eo die, atque tricesima dies eadem appellatione censetur, & primus dies solus etiam חַרֵשׁ dicitur.* So that wheresoever in Scripture mention is made of such or such a day, for example the 14 כַּחֲרֵשׁ, it may as well be rendred the 14 of the Moon, as the 14 of the Month. Thus far the Doctors own words. Now what shall we say to all this? 1. The Doctor affirms that חַרֵשׁ signifies the Moon, and would have it Translated so; and yet in his Quotations there is not one word to prove that it hath this signification, and I believe that if he consult all the *Lexicons* that are extant, he will not find

find one that saith that **כרש** doth signifie the Moon in all the Old Testament. I grant that in one place of the *Talmud Buxtorf* makes it to have this signification, as also our most diligent *D<sup>r</sup> Castell* transcribing it out of him; but I do not find the words alledg'd by *Buxtorf* in the place that he directs us to, and perhaps it is not necessary to translate those words so as *Buxtorf* hath translated them: however the word **כרש** hath not this signification any where in Sacred Writ. 2. It may also be question'd whether it signifie the New Moon, tho' most Expositors do give it this signification. I readily subscribe to the two significations which *Kimchi* mentions in his *Radices* and in his *Comment.* upon *Psal.* 81. 3. viz. that it signifies sometimes the first day of the Month, sometimes the whole Month; but when he gives this as the reason why the first day of the Month is call'd **כרש**, because the Moon is renew'd in it, I cannot so easily assent to him, but should rather say because the Month is renew'd then. The *Jews* in *Kimchi's* time and long before used Lunar Months, and so with them the Moon was renew'd constantly on the first day of the Month, and this gave the *Jewish* Writers, and particularly *Kimchi* occasion to fancy, that the first day of the Month is therefore call'd **כרש**, because the Moon is renew'd then; and this induced others to translate it

the New Moon. But there is no necessity of translating it so, and I humbly conceive that it was much better, if in all the places where our Translators have the New Moon, we instead thereof read The first day of the Month, or The beginning of the Month, or the New Month. The *Syriac* hath rendred it The beginning of the Month in most of those places, as the *Arabick* also doth in some of them, and the *Targum* in 1 *Chron.* 23. 31. 2 *Chron.* 8. 13. 31. 3. and *Isa.* 66. 23. *Kimchi* also in his *Radices* directs us to render it The first day of the Month 1 *Sam.* 20. 5, 18. 2 *Kings* 4. 23. *Isa.* 66. 23. *Ezek.* 46. 3. But the Doctor insists upon the Authority of the **LXX** who translate it *νεμνία*, and he supposes that *νεμνία* always signifies the New Moon. But why may we not translate *νεμνία* or *νεομνία* (for the **LXX** use both) The New Month? Why may they not be deriv'd from *μήν* which signifies a Month as well as from *μήνη* the Moon? *Suidas* and *Phavorinus* interpret *νεμνία* by ἡ τῆς μηνὸς ἀρχή. *Julius Pollux* by πρῶτη ἡμέρα μηνός. In the *Lexicon Græco-Latinum vetus* it is rendr'd *Initium mensis*, as well as *nova luna*. It more then once in *Plutarch* occurs in this signification Νῦν μὲν ἔν τινι αἰὶ Ῥωμαίων νεμνία πρὸς τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ὀμολογούμενον ἔχουσιν, *Plutarch. in Romulo.* Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν ἡ νεμνία τῆς πρῆτης μηνός, ἢν χαλκιδας ἀγλάει, *Id. in Galba.* All know



know that the *Roman Calends* or *νεμυνία* in *Plutarch's* time were the beginning or first day of the Month, and had no respect to the change or renovation of the Moon. We may also observe that expression of *Thucydides* l. 2. *νεμυνία καὶ σελάηνην*, which implies that there may be *νεμυνία ἢ καὶ σελάηνην*, when the Moon is not renew'd. The same expression we meet with in *Josephus Ant.* l. 4. c. 4, & *Epiphanius Hæres.* 30. num. 32, and the like in *Philo de Septenario*. And in that place of *Josephus* *νεμυνία* is rendred *mensis initium* by *Epiphanius Scholasticus*. In the LXX *νεμυνία* *Numb.* 10. 10. and 28. 12. answers to the words which we rightly translate The Beginnings of the Months. Finally, they that please may see what *Scaliger* says to this purpose, in a passage transcrib'd from him Chap. 2. If this interpretation of the words *νεμυνία* or *νεομυνία* and *שבת* be admitted, then according to both the *Hebrew* and the LXX there is not the word *New Moon* in all the Old Testament, nor according to the *Greek* in the New Testament. And there seems to be very good reason, why we should admit it and prefer it before the other, and believe that God would not once name the *New Moon*, and then surely he would not enjoin it to be observ'd as a day of gladness and a solemn day, and that peculiar Sacrifices should be offered upon it, least occasion should be

I 4

given

given to a people prone to Idolatry to worship the Moon as other Nations did. There is a remarkable passage in *Origen. Homil. 23. in Numer. Quid religioni conducit nova Luna, i. e. cum conjungitur Soli & adheret ei, observare festivitatem? Hac, si secundum litteram considerentur, non tam religiosa quam superstitiosa videbuntur.* *Origen* could not believe that the *Israelites* were commanded to observe the New Moons according to the letter, because it approach'd too near the Superstition or Idolatry of the *Gentiles* in worshiping the Moon; and therefore he interpreted the command in a Spiritual sense: But if we read (not The New Moons but) The beginnings of the Months, there will be nothing to induce any man to believe that God enjoyn'd the observation of the New Moon. Besides it seems very reasonable that all the Texts, in which according to our Translations there is mention of the New Moon, should be interpreted by that Primitive Original Ordinance or Statute, which is recorded *Numb. 10. 10. and 28. 11.* Here they are enjoyn'd to blow the Trumpet over their burnt-offerings, and the Sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and to offer two *Bullocks*, one *Ram*, and seven *Lambs* in the beginnings of their Months; there is not a word of the New Moons: and thus I humbly conceive it ought to be in all those other places,

Before

Before I conclude this, I must correct a mistake in *Petavius* by the fault of the Printer, and a greater mistake which the Doctor is guilty of whilest he would correct *Petavius*. *Petavius de doctr. Temp.* l. 3. c. 22. alledgeth a passage out of *Kimchi's Radices* concerning the signification of שרש, and in his translation of it when it should have been *Triginta dies eadem appellatione censentur*, the Printer instead of *censentur* puts *censetur*. The Doctor thinking that the mistake was not in *censetur*, but in the word *Triginta* corrects it thus *Tricesima dies eadem appellatione censetur*, as if שרש signified the Thirtieth day of the month, which never enter'd into the thoughts either of *Kimchi* or *Petavius*; for their meaning is, that all the 30 days taken together, or the whole month is sometimes signifi'd by the word שרש. I pass by the Doctors mistake about the signification of the Greek word Μην.

### *Of the men of the Great Synagogue.*

THE Doctor *Part 2. l. 2. f. 1. c. 7.* speaks of an Assembly of Holy and Wise men, which had the name of the Great Synagogue, which did immediately come after the times of the Prophets, as is testifi'd in *Pirke Abath*. *S. Jerom* stiles them the 24 Elders,

ders, 24 Senes, *in prafat. ad Efram. Malachi* might be one of the times perhaps, one of the Society ; but for the faying of the latter *Jews* that *Haggai* and *Zachary* the Prophets were of this number, and *Ezra* the head of this Assembly, I count it a very fable. These are the Doctors words in the forequoted chapter *f. 2.* And in the same section he saith, that the compiling or digesting or (as he expresseth it *f. 1.*) the bringing the whole body of Scripture and parts of it into a congruous disposition or frame, so to render the same more intelligible and plain, was the work of this Assembly of Holy and Wise men. He adds *f. 3.* that he believes that this work was directed and assisted by the Spirit of God, and *f. 4.* that this work was perfected about the time of *Alexander* the Great. Now if we would know what it is that the Doctor aims at in all this, he himself tells us in the following sections. In short he would have the Books of *Chronicles*, 6 Chapters in *Ezra*, and a great part of two Chapters in *Nehemiah* to have been written by these Holy and Wise men of the Great Synagogue. As to the Book of *Nehemiah* he is very positive, I do account (says he) that from *Neh. 11. 3.* to *Neh. 12. 27.* all is of this kind *f. 5. i. e.* inserted by the men of the Great Synagogue. He is no less positive *f. 7.* as to the second of *Chronicles*, To me (says he) it appears, that



that the Writer or Digester of this Book liv'd after *Ezra's* time. If he had said only The Digester of it, we should have taken the less notice of it; but when he saith The Writer or Digester, we see plainly what he would be at. It is true, he is not positive as to the Six Chapters in *Ezra*; but *sc.* 7. he questions whether they were the writing of *Ezra* or no (tho' he grants, that it is evident that all the Chapters after the Sixth were his writing) and signifies plainly enough, that his own opinion was that they were not.

Now this seems to be a very bold stroke, and of dangerous consequence, that any man should go about to persuade the world, that the Books of *Chronicles*, and also a considerable part of the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, were not writ till after their death. If I may use the Doctors own words, What would *Scaliger* have said to this? How would he have stood amaz'd! He that was so much displeased with the *German* Divines, who would make only some part of one Chapter in *Nehemiah* not to have been his writing, but the insertion of a later hand, would certainly have much more dislik'd such a bold attempt as this is. But he would have been more highly inrag'd, when he had found, that nothing is offer'd which looks like an argument to make it probable, that the Writers of the foresaid Books or parts of Scripture liv'd later then *Ezra* or *Nehemiah*. The

The Doctor saith that it is evident, that the two first verses of the Book of *Ezra* are the very same word for word, with the two last of the second Book of *Chronicles*. But every one sees, what a strange or rather wild consequence this is, Because the two first verses of the Book of *Ezra* are the same with the two last of *Chronicles*, therefore Six whole Chapters in *Ezra* were the writing of one that liv'd later then *Ezra*. Withal how appears it, that the Writer or Digester of the second Book of *Chronicles* liv'd after *Ezra*? That (says the Doctor) may be gathered from 1 *Chron.* 3. 17. to the end of the Chapter. But surely it cannot be gather'd from 1 *Chron.* 3. 17, &c. that the Writer or Digester of the second Book of *Chronicles* liv'd after *Ezra*, unless it can be gather'd thence, that the Writer or Digester of the first Book of *Chronicles* liv'd later then he. It must then be the Doctors meaning, that the Writer or Digester of both the Books of *Chronicles* liv'd after *Ezra*'s time. It remains then that we examine what force there is in 1 *Chron.* 3. 17, &c. to evince this.

The Doctor saith that 1 *Chron.* 3. 17. to the end of the Chapter, mention is made of Eight generations in descent from *Salathiel*, that must needs imply an extension of time beyond that of *Ezra*. He brings also a Note of the Assembly of Divines to confirm this,

As to which Note it will suffice to observe

1. That whereas the Doctor saith Eight generations, they in that Note express themselves more cautiously, saying only Many generations ; for it is not clear how many they were.

2. In it they take for granted that the generations mention'd 1 *Chron.* 3. extended beyond the days of *Ezra*, when as they should have prov'd it.

3. In that very Note they are manifestly against the Doctor, shewing plainly that it cannot be gather'd from the mention of some generations, which (as they suppose) were after *Ezra*, that the Writer or Digester of the Books of *Chronicles* liv'd after his time ; for (say they) *Ezra* might by a Prophetical Spirit set them down beforehand. Besides it appears from those words, that they inclin'd to think that *Ezra* himself was the Writer of these Books. But it may be said, that the words immediately following do make altogether for the Doctor ; for they say that some other Prophet after *Ezra's* death might add them. To which I reply, that there is no agreement at all between them and the Doctor, for 1. The Doctor says positively, that it appears to him that the Writer or Digester of these Books of *Chronicles* liv'd after *Ezra's* time ; they say only, that some Prophet after *Ezra's* death might add some generations at the end of the third Chapter of the first Book. 2. They say,

say, that some Prophet after *Ezra's* death might add them, as the death and burial of *Moses* is added to his last Book, *Dent. 34.* Thus they. As then it cannot be concluded from the addition of the death and burial of *Moses Dent. 34.* that the rest of the Book of *Deuteronomy* was not written by *Moses*: so it cannot be gathered from the addition of a generation or, two *1 Chron. 3.* that the rest of the Books of *Chronicles* was not writ by *Ezra. 3.* The mention of adding them after *Ezra's* death implies, that the Books to which they were added were writ before his death. This Note then clearly overthrows that for which it is alledg'd by the Doctor.

As to the Book of *Ezra*, the Doctor further hints that in the Preface of the Seventh Chapter, which is *Και μετα ρήματα ταῦτα*, the Compilers mark is visible. Thus the Doctor f. 8. As if it was visible and apparent from these words *Ezra 7. 1. After these things*, that we owe all the Six Chapters foregoing, not to *Ezra* himself, but the Compiler. Or as if *Ezra* having in the Six former Chapters dispatched the History of *Cyrus, Darius, &c.* and now passing to that of *Artaxerxes* from whom he receiv'd his Commission, might not use this note of connexion *Now after these things.* How frequently do these words occur, as in the



the History of the Old and New Testament, so in all other Histories whatsoever?

As to the Book of *Nehemiah* the Doctor offers nothing at all that can tend to prove, that so great a part of it, as from *Neh.* 11. 3. to *Neh.* 12. 27. is not his own handwriting, but the adjection of another hand.

Now to return to the men of the Great Synagogue. The Doctor says *f.* 2. that *S. Hierome* calls them the 24 Elders. But tho' the Doctor is guilty of several very great and unhappy mistakes, yet I think there is scarce any thing in which he hath erred more strangely then in this. For there is not the least mention of the Great Synagogue in all that Preface of *S. Hierome* to the Book of *Ezra*, which the Doctor alledgeth. *S. Hierome* is speaking of Canonical and Apocryphal Books, and by his 24 Elders we are to understand the 24 Canonical Books of the Old Testament. This will be made clear, if we compare the words in that Preface to *Ezra*, with a passage in his *Prologo Galeato* or *Prefat. in librum Regum*, as also in his Comment. upon *Ezek.* 43. In his *Prolog. Galeat.* having spoken of the 24 Books of the Old Testament, he immediately adds *Quos sub numero 24 Seniorum Apocalypsis Joannis inducit, adorantes agnum, & coronas suas prostra-*

115

*tis vultibus offerentes, &c.* In his Comment. on Ezek. 43. he hath these words, *Vel 24 libri veteris Instrumenti debent accipi, qui habebant citharas in Apocalypsi Joannis, & coronas in capitibus suis.* Now please to compare with these the words in *Præfat. in Ezram.* which the Doctor refers to. I shall transcribe them at large. *Nec quenquam moveat (says he) quod unus à nobis liber editus est, nec Apocryphorum tertii & quarti libri somniis delectetur, quia apud Hebræos Esdra Neemiaque sermones in unum volumen coarctantur, & qua non habentur apud illos, nec de 24 Senibus sunt, procul abjicienda.* I hope it is now plain, that S. Hierome hath no respect to the men of the Great Synagogue, but to the 24 Elders in the Revelation, whom he interprets to be the 24 Canonical Books of the Old Testament. And his meaning in those words, *Nec de 24 Senibus sunt, procul abjicienda* is, that they which are not of those 24 Books are to be rejected as Apocryphal. Add hereto, that they reckon 12 as the heads and chief of the men of that Synagogue, but I do not find that any of the Jewish Writers reduce the whole number of them to 24. They usually make them to have been 120, but in *Cezri Part 3.* it is said, that they were not numbred, or could not be numbred for multitude.

The Doctor further saith *f. 2.* that for the  
say

saying of the later *Jews*, that *Haggai* and *Zachary* were of this number, and *Ezra* the Head of this Assembly, he accounts it a very Fable. To which I shall only say, 1. He may account so of it if he pleases, for there want not those who account the whole story concerning the Great Synagogue to be no other; they think that the *Jews* feign'd that there was such an Assembly, that they might father their Traditions upon it. But the Doctor will not allow of this, for it overthrows a great part of that which he saith in this and some other Chapters. 2. No man (as far as I know) requires it to be believ'd as a certain truth. For though some eminent *Jewish* Writers (as *Maimonides* in his Preface to his Book *Iad*, and in his Preface to *Seder Zeraim* set forth by *D<sup>r</sup> Pocock*, with others) do affirm, that *Haggai*, *Zachary* and *Ezra* the Scribe were of this number, yet there are likewise some that make no mention of them, but name others in their stead (see *R. Abraham ben David* in his *Cabala*) yea in *Cozri Part 3*. *Haggai*, *Zachary* and *Ezra* seem very plainly to be distinguish'd from the men of the Great Synagogue. 3. The Doctor gives no reason why he doth account it a very Fable; perhaps then the great reason is, because it will not suit with his Hypothesis. And this may suffice for answer to that which the Doctor saith concerning the men of the Great Synagogue.

To conclude, This Defence of Arch-Bishop *Usher* is a further confirmation of the truth of that which I asserted in the Introduction, *viz.* The uncertainty of the greatest part of Chronology: When these two great undertakers in Chronology *D<sup>r</sup> Is. Vossius* and *D<sup>r</sup> Carry*, who express so great assurance in their Writings, and insult so much over the Arch-Bishop and others, are upon examination found to be guilty of very great mistakes, and to have proceeded upon as uncertain grounds as others had done before them. And yet *D<sup>r</sup> Carry* hath entertain'd so high an opinion of his own performance, that in his Epistle Dedicatory, he told King *Charles* the second, that his Chronology speaks the truth (haply) better then any whatsoever of late days, and in our Climate, hath been found to do. A little before he had said that his Chronology is a kind of Clock, and so though several of late days and in our Climate too have pretended to the Art of Clockmaking or Clockmending, the Doctor hath outdone them all, his Clock speaks the truth (haply) better then any of theirs whatsoever. So that henceforth there will be no need of a *Scaliger de Emendatione Temporum*, or a *Lydiats Emendatio Temporum*. In the same Epistle he also told King *Charles* that it had been under the Hammer and the File for many years; and I believe that he spake the truth in it, and am  
 sorry



sorry that he laid out so much time as well as pains in an unprofitable Study, neglecting that to which his Function did oblige him, viz. the fitting himself rightly to understand and interpret the Scriptures. That he neglected this, is too apparent from the strange interpretations that he gives of sundry passages in Sacred Writ. I wish that all may be warn'd by his example, that so much pains and so many precious hours may not be thrown away hereafter upon Chronological Niceties.

---

# ERRATA.

P Ag. 4. lin. 29. read *Et Lactantium*. p. 6. l. 15. read *Sardana-*  
*palus*. p. 8. l. 18. dele *Comma*. p. 25. l. 17. dele *Comma*.  
 p. 36. l. 7, 8. read רמשי חרשום p. 50. l. 16. dele *Comma* after  
*Charon*. p. 68. l. 17. read *Hystaspes*. p. 70. l. 30. read *Scythians*.  
 p. 75. l. 12 and 16. read *Shepherds*. p. 88. l. 16. dele *Comma*.  
 p. 104. l. 10. dele *Comma* after *Defensione*.

# FINIS.